NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

Without Concealment-----Without Compromise.

VOLUME V.---NO. 15. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1844. WHOLE NUMBER 223.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.
At 142, Nassau Street, New-York.

Sydney Howard Gay,
Maria Weston Chapman, } **Editors.**
Edmund Quincy,

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to SYDNEY HOWARD GAY.

Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer, at Boston; or to S. H. GAY, Assistant Treasurer, at New-York.

TERMS.—$2 00 a year, in advance; $2 50 if not paid within six months.

☞ $10 00, in advance, will pay for SIX copies, for one year, sent to one address.

☞ TWENTY copies, or more, will be sent to one address, at $1 50 each.

☞ Subscribers can remit money without expense by observing the following rule of the Post-Office Department: "A postmaster may enclose money in a letter to the publisher of a newspaper, to pay the subscription of a third person, and frank the letter, if written by himself."

H. M. HENRY, PRINTER.

Selections.

From the Liberator.

LETTER FROM HENRY C. WRIGHT.

GRAEFENBERG, Austrian Silesia, June 28, 1844.

DEAR GARRISON:—Once more I wish to talk with thee from amid these mountains of Silesia. Priessnitz assures me that all disease is removed from my lungs, and I am sure he is right in this case. My physical constitution has been entirely renovated, and restored to its original strength and hardihood, so far as I can judge, by the water-cure. Having taken no alcoholic nor warm drinks, of any kind, for many years, but having taken only cold water, and having never taken a particle of calomel, nor been bled, in my life, the water-cure took hold of me more favorably than of most, and operated more speedily, and powerfully, and beneficially. I shall leave here for Olmutz the first opportunity after next Monday, the first day of July. My route to England, I believe I stated in my last. It will probably take me several weeks to get to London, as I shall not hurry, but see what I can.

The other day, I was in conversation with a woman from Posin, the capital of that part of Poland which, in the division of that country among the robber kings of Europe, fell to the share of Prussia. She is a woman in the common walks of life, her husband being a mechanic. She was asking me about the United States; about where I lived, about Philadelphia, &c.; and at once she abruhlty turned, and asked with earnestness, "Are you a slaveholder?" "No," I said, "I am not guilty of that foul and detestable crime." With an eager and expressive countenance, she reached across to where I sat, and shook my hand, and said, "I am glad to hear it." "I am an enemy to the death," I said, "of all slavery and oppression; and I wish every religious, governmental, and social institution on earth, that cannot exist without the sacrifice of human victims in slavery or war, was destroyed." "But," said she, "what can Americans mean by calling themselves civilized and Christian men, while they hold one-sixth of their countrymen as property?" Sure enough—what do they mean? And thus the United States, as a nation, has become a hissing and a scorn in Europe; even among all classes, from the prince to the peasant, she is scorned and despised for her bare-faced hypocrisv. Her crime, her deep and damning sin, is known all over the world; and those who are ground to the dust, under the blood-cemented despotisms of Europe, have hearts to feel for the American slave, and they at once reply—as I have often heard it replied by men and women from all these countries—"We are indeed cruelly crushed by tyrannical rulers and laws, but we are not bought and sold like cattle—we are not *property*—we are not born and reared for the market—and the influence of America can never help to break *our* chains while she holds slaves."

Our saloon has, within the last five weeks, been a theatre of much discussion on American affairs. The case of Brown, condemned to death for helping a runaway slave—the most atrocious and most infamous conduct of the North Carolina Yearly Meeting of Friends, in condemning their members for aiding runaways—the atrocious conduct of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in General Conference, in refusing the testimony of their colored members in church discipline—the fact that one-sixth of the population of the United States are *compelled* to live in a state of concubinage, without legal marriage—the fact that the American Union is, in its very nature, and essence, and practical influence, a conspiracy against the rights and liberties of mankind, a compact of man-stealers—the manœuvres to get Texas into the Union, to extend over that fertile country the institution of Slavery—the correspondence between Upshur and Everett—the letter of Calhoun—the treaty signed by Tyler—the movements of Gaines upon the frontier of Texas—the contemptible political manœuvrings in the letters of Clay and Van Buren—the desperation of the United States in rushing into a war with Mexico, and through that into the chances of a war with the different powers of Europe—her willingness to assume the debts of that Texan band of man-stealers and land-pirates, and all, solely to sustain and perpetuate the institution of Slavery—the contempt with which the petitions and resolutions of the free States have been treated in Congress—all these matters have made their appearance in our saloons, in substance, in newspapers from Petersburg, Berlin, Vienna, Paris and London—the capitals of five of the most despotic governments in the world. (the United States excepted,) at least in Europe—Russia, Prussia, Austria, France and England. These things are circulated through the columns of the governmental papers of these hoary despotisms, and papers that are not allowed to publish one word touching the doings of the rulers and governments at home, are allowed to hold up our slaveholding republic as a hypocrite and tyrant, a libel on all truth and honesty, and as a specimen of democracy.

Many times have I been questioned as to the details of American slavery, in that saloon, by Russians, Poles, Prussians, Austrians, Hungarians, Italians, Danes and Tyrolese. I lay before them facts which no American who is here, (and there are several here) dares to deny, though they think I act an ungrateful and unpatriotic part in thus publishing the atrocities of my country. My answer to them is, that I am not an American citizen, as they understand it; that I loathe the name *American*, and never wish to be recognized as one; that I have no country, and never wish to have, as they count country; that human beings, not human customs and institutions, not certain parallels of latitude and longitude, constitute my country and my countrymen; that I have no country, no social or civil institutions to ridicule; that I would live but to honor God and man, and to vindicate them from the outrages and insults poured upon them by the religious and governmental institutions of this world. So they find no *nationalism* in me to appeal to, they see that I am a *gone case*, and they let me alone; but yet they cannot, and they do not attempt to deny my statements, when I tell these crouching, cowering victims (for, titled and ennobled though they are, they are still victims) of a tyrant's frown and a tyrant's nod, that one-sixth of the whole population of the United States are, by law, pronounced incapable of making any contract that is counted binding, in regard to property or to marriage; that they are compelled to herd together, men and women, like beasts, in a state of concubinage; that one-sixth of the population is declared, by law, to be incapable of holding property, and their testimony forbidden to be received in courts against their oppressors; that it is a crime in one-sixth of the population, punishable with stripes and imprisonment, to learn to read the Bible, and a crime punishable with death to attempt, by any means, to improve their condition—a crime punishable with outlawry and death for a slave to attempt to gain his liberty in any way, by running away—and a crime punishable with imprisonment and death to help a slave to gain his liberty by running away; that one-sixth of the population are held as mere chattels personal, and that children are sold from parents, and parents from children, with no more regard to the ties of relationship, than is shown in buying and selling hogs and horses; that men, such as Jackson, Tyler, Clay, and Polk, who perpetrate all these villanies, are chosen, or set up to be chosen, to the highest office in the nation; and that thousands, who live by stealing, not dogs and sheep, but men, women, and children, are licensed, ordained and consecrated by the different religious sects, to go up and down the country to preach the gospel, and to pray and exhort the people not to steal, but to be just and honest to all men! These facts I have laid before thousands in Europe—in England, Ireland, and in Austria—as real, existing facts, as the true state of things in the United States; and I have never yet met one from America, on this side of the Atlantic, (and I have met many,) who, when challenged so to do, could deny my statements, or my reasons for making them.

Well, my friend, I have not contributed much to the honor of the American nation, among these despotisms. I cannot, while that nation stands with one foot on the neck of the slave, and the other on the Bible, while she holds her far-famed Declaration in one hand and a slave chain and whip in the other—I can never wish to have her honored anywhere on earth. I will do what I can to bring down upon her the scorn and execration of all the world.

Yet, while I thus hold up and denounce the American Union, as an insult to God, and an outrage on man—as a compact entered into among thieves and robbers, to legalize and protect themselves in their unparalleled hypocrisy, injustice and oppression—and while I hesitate not to plead for the dissolution of that hell-begotten Union, as a foul attempt to reconcile Liberty and Slavery at the expense of the most useful portion of the population—i. e. the tillers of the land—and while I exult, with all my soul, here among these minions of despotism in Austria, that a flag is hoisted there, before the whole nation, with the inscription—"DISSOLUTION OR ABOLITION"—still, as to the great fundamental principles of that government, as embodied in the Bills of Rights, Declarations and Constitutions,—and as these principles are carried into practise in some parts of the country, and especially in regard to the whites, the oppressors—the United States, as a nation, is centuries in advance of any kingdom in Europe. Here, the tillers of the soil are mere tenants at will, as it were—the lands being all in the hands of the few, while the great mass of the people have not a foot of land to lay their bodies in when they die; but there, the tillers of the soil own the land which they cultivate. Here, the design of all education, whether in schools, in pulpits, or at home, is, to teach the people how to be managed to the best advantage for their self-elected and birth-right managers; there, the object is to teach the people to manage themselves. Here, the individual is lost, completely merged, in the governmental and religious compact; there, some individuality is yet left. Here, the people are trained to be governed; there, to govern themselves. Here, there is no such thing as freedom of combination, deliberation, and communication; there, this freedom is unrestrained. Here, the press is muzzled, and is a mere engine of Government; there, it is free to speak, and is the agent of the people. Here, power is hereditary, and confined to a few; there, it belongs to every one, at least in the abstract. Here, only property and rank are represented in government; there, to some extent, human beings are represented, provided they are not *black!* (Shame, eternal shame!) In a word, here human beings are made for institutions; there, institutions are made for human beings. Here, man is an appendage to institutions; there, institutions are appendages to man.

The other day, when I was drawing this contrast between the United States and the despotisms of Europe, I was asked by an Austrian Count—"Do you speak this as a white man, or a black? as a slave, or a freeman? Do you speak it as feeling for those of your countrymen in bonds, as bound with them?" I was dumb. How could I speak? What could I say? If I were wading the swamps, threading the forests, swimming the rivers, concealing myself in dens and caves, running for liberty, and were tracked by bloodhounds and rifles—seized by the nation, the Constitution, the UNION, and hauled back to stripes, bonds and Slavery—what could I say? If I were standing, with my wife and children, on an auction block in the national capital, with the star-spangled banner of the republic over me, and there saw my wife sold, to be dragged from my bosom in one direction, my children torn from my arms to be dragged in another, and then to be sold myself and driven in another—what could I say of the nation, of the people, of the institutions, of the religion and Government, which could thus crush me, and tread me in the dust? Yes—the Austrian Count's rebuke will ever ring in my ears—"DO YOU SPEAK AS AN AMERICAN SLAVE, OR AS AN AMERICAN FREEMAN?" As an American slave, henceforth I speak! As an American slave, I will pour out my indignant rebukes upon that tyrant nation—upon her religion and her Government, upon her priests and her rulers. As an American slave, I wil hold up to scorn and execration the despotisms of Europe. As an American slave, I will trample in the dust the American banner that waves over my wife and children on an auction stand. As an American slave, I will set at naught all geographical lines and national boundaries, and all compacts and unions, all religions and governments, all thrones and dominions, that directly or indirectly, help to hold me, or a single member of the human family, in slavery.

I have no comfort in the enjoyment of rights and immunities, of which a fellow-being, as deserving, as much a child of God, as myself, is deprived. "Talk not of rights and privileges accorded to you," said a Prussian Baron one day, "while the same Government that accords them to you, denies them to your enslaved countrymen. It is neither just nor generous." How can I talk of the blessings of liberty in America, when I know that none of these blessings is ever extended to the slave? How can I talk of American liberty, when I know that one-sixth of her population are held as mere chattels? American liberty! It is, and it ought to be, the scorn and execration of the world. American religion! American democracy! they are, and they ought to be, despised and loathed by heathendom and Christendom.

O'CONNELL is the lion of the day in Europe. The papers, all over continental Europe, takes sides with him. An effort made in Prussia, by many individuals, in their private capacity, to remonstrate with England, and sympathize with O'Connell, has made a great noise. No man, since Napoleon, has filled so large a space in the eye of this world as O'Connell. No man ever wielded such influence, by such means, over so many minds. Every step in the prosecution and condemnation has only increased his fame; and now, confined to a prison, O'Connell is more loved, more respected, more honored, has more sympathy, more power, more glory, than ever before. In Parliament, in addressing hundreds of thousands, he never controlled so many hearts as at this moment. England rushes on to her destiny. She has done all she could to provoke the Irish to deeds of violence and blood. Heaven be praised, thus far without effect. Repeal and O'Connell are the all-absorbing topics in Europe. Even Nicholas of Russia, in England, is lost sight of in the deep interest felt in O'Connell and Repeal.

I bid adieu to Graefenberg, with mingled pleasure and pain. Probably not on earth can you find such a combination as is found in this place, and in our saloon. The characteristics of fifteen different nations there meet and mingle, and in a measure are merged into a peculiar people. Under the eye of our Peasant Nobleman—for nobleman he is, of Heaven's make—our community assumes the form of a democracy, of self-government, under God. We have a Graefenberg dialect, compounded of all other languages, spoken here. We have a Graefenberg character, that can exist nowhere else—a Graefenberg mode of living, a Graefenberg state of society, that can nowhere else be found. One thing is certain—a few such institutions as this, scattered over the earth, would do more to secure the peace and prosperity of mankind, than all the guns and bayonets, the priests and politicians, the armies and governments and treaties of this world. Individual hearts are here knit together, and a chord of individual love and sympathy reaching around the globe. This is the true and enduring treaty of peace—the union, in love in sympathy, of individual hearts—an extension of personal acquaintance and friendship all over the world. Thine, H. C. WRIGHT.

☞ Thousands of hearts in this country will leap for joy to hear of the recovery of our noble-hearted brother Wright. His case was so critical that, had he not gone to Graefenberg, in all probability he could not long have survived; for consumption seemed to have "marked him for its own," almost beyond the possibility of escape. His restoration is alone a high paneyric on the Water-Cure system, and we trust will be the means of bringing that system more widely into notice.

GERRIT SMITH'S CONSTITUTIONAL ARGUMENT.

PETERBORO', July 18, 1844.

John G. Whittier, of Massachusetts:

MY DEAR FRIEND:—I welcomed the organization of the Non-Resistant Society. I flattered myself that, among its least benefits, it would help solve my doubts respecting the "Peace Question." I hung up its "Declaration of Sentiments" in one of the most public rooms of my house. It hangs there still. If its doctrines are not true, (and, though not yet convinced that they are, neither am I yet clear that they are not,) they, nevertheless, testify most honorably to the conscientiousness, self-denial and intrepidity of its signers. The organization of this Society was a bold assault on Civil Government: and the rightfulness of Civil Government I had never been taught to question. Still, I was willing to see Civil Government fall, if it could be shown that to take human life is wrong;—for I could not deny that the taking—or what, in principle, is the same thing, the threatening—of human life, is essential to the maintenance of Civil Government.

The Liberty party, no less, of course, than other political parties, recognizes the rightfulness of Civil Government. It is, therefore, consistent for the Non-Resistants to oppose it; and they do oppose it. But, notwithstanding this opposition, the party is increasing. It will not yield to the argument, that Civil Government is a wrong institution; or, in other words, that the inviolability of human life, which is the fundamental principle of the Non-Resistants, is a right principle. But their failure to overcome the Liberty party, by the force of this principle, has not discouraged the Non-Resistants. They have, recently, rallied for a new attack, on a new ground, that the Federal Constitution is a pro-slavery instrument. Their grandest and most trumpeted deduction from the assumed pro-slavery character of this instrument is, that the Northern States should separate from the Southern States. A deduction so illegitimate and absurd, should not, indeed, be suffered to call in question the soundness of the premises; but, it necessarily impeaches the wisdom of those who make it. That wisdom had, already, become questionable. It had become so when the Non-Resistants, alleging that some four or five prominent members of the Liberty party were bad men, made this allegation a sufficient ground for urging the party to disband. It has become so, in view of the extravagance of the charges against these men; and in view of the wonder of the Non-Resistants, that these charges, which made our Stanton, and Leavitt, and Birney, and Tappans, guilty of a State-prison grade of offences, were not believed. An old lady, who lived and died in my neighborhood, used to say to persons who were about to carry their claims into Courts of Law: "Don't lay your action too high." Great as is the popular credulity, nevertheless, the Non-Resistants, in preferring the charges in question, "laid their action too high" for it. Abby Kelley expressed her surprise, last fall, that I had not investigated these charges. I, very probably, should have investigated them, if they had not "laid the action too high" for my bump of marvellousness. Were I to see a newspaper article, entitled, "W. L. Garrison a horse thief," or "Edmund Quincy, a burglar," I should either not read it at all, or read it to enjoy a joke. The article would "lay its action too high" to merit my sober reading. And yet, it could not surpass, in extravagance, the reproaches which these very gentlemen have uttered in America, and which their brother, John A. Collins, was commissioned to utter in England, of men, whose integrity is, certainly, as far above suspicion as is that of their accusers.

But, to return from this digression:—why should Slavery, as the Non-Resistants say it should, separate the North from the South? Why should Northern slaveholders disdain connection with Southern slaveholders? Why should "pot call kettle black?" The slaveholding North, so far from being less guiltv than the slaveholding South, is as much guiltier, as greater light and weaker temptation can make it. The national parts of Slavery—such as Slavery in the District of Columbia and the territory of Florida—depending, as they do, for continued existence on the will of the North—are much more guilty than the Slavery in the Southern States, as the people of those States are less aroused, than the people of the Northern, to the wickedness of Slavery. Nay, the laws and usages, by which the free people of color in the Northern States are vexed, hampered, outraged, crushed, constitute so gratuitous, so wantonly wicked a chiming with the slaveholding policy of the South, and so indispensable a prop of this policy, as to make them not less guilty than her bloodiest slave codes. When I think of this project of separating the Northern from the Southern States, I am led to ask, as did Mr. Webster, in one of his Faneuil Hall speeches: "Where shall *I* go?"—and finding my answer also, in the words of another, (Mr. Gurley,) reply: "I go with the South." If I must go with the North or the South, let it be with the least guilty—and that is the South.

The American Anti-Slavery Society, which, whatever it may have been up to this time, is, certainly, now in the hands of the Non-Resistants, and does certainly now take its tone from them, calls upon us to "agitate, agitate," for the separation of the Northern from the Southern States. Not to speak of any other evil, that will result from this agitation;—how strong will be its tendency to create and foster the delusion, that, in the matter of Slavery, the North is guiltless, and has nothing to do but to get out of the bad company into which her innocence has been drawn.

Why should we regard the Federal Constitution as pro-slavery? Whenever I read it, it presents itself as a noble and beautiful Temple of Liberty. Whenever I read its preamble, I see the Goddess of Liberty standing in the porch of this Temple; and, whenever I read its Amendments, so fraught as they are with the deep solicitude of our fathers for the utmost security of human rights, I see in them the buttresses, by which the builders of this Temple gave it additional strength and glory. Is the Constitution pro-slavery because the Government of the United States has, almost from its beginning, been administered for the advantage of Slavery? As well might you hold the Constitution responsible for any other trampling on its principles. To seek in that instrument for authority for the conduct of Government, in the cases of the Creole, Amistad, Florida War, or in any other of its murderous and diabolical agencies in behalf of Slavery, would be as vain, as to seek there for the justification of its violations of Indian Treaties. (What, however, were these violations for, but to serve the demands of slaveholders?) The fact, that the nation, in its national capacity, favors and upholds Slavery, proves nothing against the Constitution;—for this it may do, and the Constitution not be responsible for it—for this it may do, in utter repugnance and in bold defiance of the Constitution.

I repeat my question: "Why should we regard the Federal Constitution as pro-slavery?" Is it because it does not, specifically, provide for the overthrow of Slavery in the States which adopted it? It does not provide for the correction of any of their vicious practices; and is it, therefore, proper to say that it is in favor of gambling and drunkenness? It certainly is, if it is proper to say that its want of jurisdiction, in respect to the slavery of those States, merits the stigma of being pro-slavery. I ask again: "Why should we regard the Federal Constitution as pro-slavery?" Is it because of its guarantees of Slavery? I hear and read, frequently, of these guarantees. Even distinguished statesmen speak and write of them. But it is in vain that I look into the Constitution for them. They are not there; nor any thing else which bears the slightest resemblance to guarantees of Slavery. Or, is the Constitution pro-slavery, because of the existence of slavery in the District of Columbia, in the territory of Florida, and under the protection of the American flag? But all this slavery is, manifestly, in violation of, not in accordance with, the Constitution. It was well said by Mr. Davis, on the floor of Congress last winter: "Congress can no more make a slave than a king."

When it is said that the Constitution is pro-slavery, the proper interpretation of the charge is, that the Constitution does itself favor Slavery—does itself contribute to uphold it. But, that the charge so interpreted, is unsustainable, none can deny. Who can deny that the faithful carrying out of the principles of the Constitution would result in the speedy abolition of the whole system of American Slavery? Who believes that this system could endure five years, should Congress, at its next session, abolish Slavery in the District of Columbia and in the territory of Florida, and, with a concurring Executive and Judiciary, go to the whole extent of the Constitutional duty in withholding protection from the abomination, and in discountenancing it? Who believes that American Slavery could have endured until this time, had the Government conformed to the Constitution, and confined Slavery to the original thirteen States? Must we call that a pro-slavery instrument when they who framed, and they who adopted it, believed, and joyfully believed, that American Slavery was to endure but a few years? That such was the belief, at that time, of well nigh the whole country, is manifest from the fact that Congress, under the confederation, in 1787, unanimously decided, and that Congress under the Constitution, two years after, did also, with the single exception of Robert Yates, of New York, unanimously decide, that the vast territory north of the Ohio, from which we have erected several States, should be forever clear of Slavery. That the Constitution was framed in 1787, and adopted two years afterwards, shows a remarkable and instructive coincidence with the above dates. And must we call that a pro-slavery instrument, the pages of which are unpolluted by the words "Slave" and "Slavery"?—and not one line of which will transmit to posterity the disgraceful fact, that Slavery was ever among the crimes of the American people?—and not one line of which will need alteration to adapt it, more perfectly, to the state of things in our country, when Slavery shall have totally disappeared from it?

Away then with the charge that the Federal Constitution is pro-slavery! Not so, however, it is said; for there are in that instrument, as alleged, some pro-slavery exceptions to its confessedly reigning Anti-Slavery principles. But, if these exceptions exists, it is, nevertheless, untrue, that they are entitled to give character to the instrument. The current of a stream is not determined by its eddies; nor a principle overthrown by the exceptions to it. The general principles, scope and tendency of the Federal Constitution, decide whether it is, or is not, pro-slavery. Nothing, however, would be risked by conceding that the supposed exceptions have power to decide this question;—for in the whole instrument there is not one pro-slavery line—not one line, which justly interpreted, contributes to the upholding of Slavery. All agree that, if there is such a line, it is found in the provision, respecting the *apportionment of representatives;* or, in that respecting "*the migration or importation" of certain persons;* or in those respecting "*insurrections" and "domestic violence";* or in that respecting "*a person held to service or labor.*"

There is no evidence, whatever, that the first mentioned provision was designed to promote slavery. On the contrary, it is a bounty on liberty, and presents a strong inducement to every State to raise its inhabitants to freemen. Rather than call it a pro-slavery provision, I would charge it with seeking to promote the Anti-Slavery cause, not only at the expense of concerning itself impertinently with the internal institutions and arrangements of the States, but even at the expense of violating the great Constitutional principle, that every man is a man—a whole man—and in no part a chattel. Not only the Supreme Court of the United States, but all the ablest expounders of the Constitution, give this principle a place in it; and maintain that the Constitution knows no man as a slave—knows no man as less, or other, than a person. I complain of the provision in question for its unmanning process. It should have suffered every man, especially every man who has not lost his freedom by his crimes, to count *one.* This reduction of a man to the fraction of a man is an indignity to sacred manhood, which, even if one of its purposes was to subserve the cause of freedom, is not only unatoned for by that purpose, but it is entirely unadapted to subserve that cause. Far better were it for that cause, if this three-fifthing of a man, who has fallen under the yoke of Slavery, had not taken place; and if every such man had been counted a whole one. But it is said that, inasmuch as the slaves are not allowed to vote, and their interests are, therefore, not only not represented, but misrepresented by those who get elected to office, they ought not to be counted at all in the apportionment of representatives. There are States, however, in which white men, unless they have property, cannot vote, and in which they are, consequently, misrepresented by those who get office;—nevertheless, they are reckoned in the apportionment; and we all do, and should, think it right that they are. The free people of color (numbering some four hundred thousand) are, from the denial of the right of nearly all of them to vote, as much unrepresented and misrepresented as the slaves; and yet no one denies the propriety of their being included in the apportionment. It is contended that the Constitution studying the protection of the slave, should have shut them entirely out of the apportionment. But in my judgment, it should no more have done this than have sought to protect the poor white man and the free colored man, by visiting upon them a similar degradation. These three classes of men are all wronged;—not, however, in being counted in the apportionment—in being counted by the nation—but being disfranchised by their respective States. They and their interests are unrepresented and misrepresented, not through the fault of the Constitution, but through their want of votes.

The Non-Resistants lay great stress on Mr. Adams's and Mr. Giddings's late Report. Shame on them that they do! These two gentlemen would have us believe that the Constitutional provisions under consideration—that the counting of slaves in the apportionment of representatives—is the reason why the Government is administered in behalf of Slavery. Shame on Mr. Adams and Mr. Giddings also! Shame on them for keeping out of view the fact, that the whites of the free States, being more than twice as numerous as the whites of the slave States, can have an Anti-Slavery Administration whenever they please! Shame on them for thus attempting to turn off the public eye from the true cause why our Administrations are pro-slavery!—That cause will cease, and only then, when Mr. Adams and Mr. Giddings, and the other men of the North shall cease from the crime of electing pro-slavery men to office. That Mr. Adams and Mr. Giddings should, whilst holding votes for Henry Clay between their fingers, set up such a loud lament over the tendency of the Constitution to sustain Slavery, would most certainly pass for the height of affectation, if it were not true that even the wisest and best men may be the subjects of very glaring delusions. And is it not a great shame that the Non-Resistants should use this Report of Mr. Adams and Mr. Giddings to justify their interpretation of the Constitution, when they so well know that this Report goes to relieve the conscience of the North, by concealing the fact of the ability and duty of the North to overthrow the national parts, and arrest the spread of Slavery; and to relieve it, too, by referring the aggressions of Slavery to a fault in the Constitution and in our fathers, rather than to ourselves and to our violations of the principles of that instrument?

The provision respecting the African slave-trade, (for I admit that, if not exclusively, it nevertheless respects that,) is to be regarded as anti-slavery, because it is a part of an anti-slavery agreement. This provision, and the power of Congress over commerce, show what is this agreement;—for, notwithstanding they lack juxtaposition in the Constitution, they make up this agreement. But, for the qualification of the power by the provision, the power would not have been granted. That the agreement in question is Anti-Slavery, is deduced from the following considerations.

Before the Colonies came under the Federal Constitution, they were independent of each other, and of the world. They had, each, as perfect a right as any State or nation, to prosecute the African slave-trade, and to prosecute it, too, forever. But now, each agreed with its partners under the new compact—not that it would continue this trade for nineteen years, (that would have been a pro-slavery agreement)—but that, if it continued it at all, it would discontinue it after nineteen years, (and that makes it an anti-slavery agreement.) Had the agreement been, that each of the partners would, forthwith, discontinue the traffic, it would certainly have been of a far more meritorious Anti-Slavery character; but that does not render the actual agreement pro-slavery. I enter into a partnership, mercantile or other, with a man who is a drunkard, and I obtain from him a written stipulation that he will drink no more intoxicating liquor after six months; and that, should he, I may resort even to force itself to restrain his indulgence. Now, I readily admit, that a stipulation for the immediate relinquishment of his vice would far more deserve the name of a temperance stipulation. Nevertheless, I cannot consent that what I do obtain from him, argues no regard, on my part, for temperance. Still less can I consent that it makes me responsible for his continued intemperance, and numbers me with the opposers of temperance. So is it with the Constitution. If it does less against the African slave-trade than is desirable, it nevertheless should have credit for what it does. Above all, that which it does against the trade, should not be construed into friendship for it.

I am aware that it may be said, that a Colony, on coming into our Union, acquired a more efficient protection for its commerce than it before enjoyed. Let this incidental advantage to the African slave-trade—this incidental additional security to it—pass for what it is worth, toward giving a pro-slavery character to the anti-slavery agreement under consideration.

I close my remarks under this head by saying, that the year eighteen hundred and eight, has long since passed away; and that if ever the Constitution had a pro-slavery operation, in virtue of its relation to the African slave-trade, that operation has long since ceased.

The provisions concerning "insurrection," and "domestic violence," are neither pro-slavery, nor anti-slavery. The powers which they convey are indispensable to prevent and arrest lawlessness and bloodshed—are indispensable, indeed, to the upholding of Civil Government. It is true that these powers may, sometimes, be employed against a wrong one: for lawlessness and violence are more frequently called in to the aid of a wrong, than a right cause. If the provisions in question stand in the way of the lawless and violent abolition of Slavery, so also do they stand in the way of the like abolition of every other form of evil; and so do they stand in the way of every lawless and violent attempt to introduce or establish any form of good. They forbid the helping of the cause of liberty by the lawless and violent breaking up of Slavery. But they also forbid the helping of the cause of temperance by the lawless and violent breaking up of distilleries and rumshops; and the helping of the cause of purity by the like breaking up of brothels. So, too, let a system of religion be ever so perfect, these provisions of the Constitution forbid the introduction or propagation of it by lawlessness and violence. I need say no more of these provisions, than that, inasmuch as they hinder not the application of lawful and peaceful means for the overthrow of Slavery, they hinder not the application of the only means, which Abolitionists choose to employ, or have employed.

The last provision of the Constitution which I have proposed to examine, respects fugitives from service. Greater reliance is placed on this, than on any other, to prove that the Constitution is pro-slavery: and the arguments drawn, and attempted to be drawn, from this provision, to prove the pro-slavery character of the Constitution, have been immeasurably more embarrassing to the Liberty party, than those drawn, and attempted to be drawn, from any, or every other part of that instrument.

Even under the pro-slavery construction of this provision, it can, constitutionally, operate but little in favor of Slavery. For no fugitive from the District of Columbia, or the Territory of Florida, or from any slave State, which is not one of the original thirteen States, or which, at farthest, was not erected within one of them; and no fugitive from any one of those thirteen States, who has ever been permitted to go beyond the present, or at farthest, beyond the original boundaries of those States, can, in the eye of the Constitution, be a slave. Again, the tide of northern anti-slavery sentiment has risen so high, and acquired so much strength, as to bear to almost certain safety, every fugitive who is so fortunate as to get upon it. Not ten in a thousand of the runaway slaves who now reach a free State, are replunged into Slavery. Again, if the part of the Constitution which we are now considering, or any other part, be found to be in conflict with righteousness, let us remember that the Constitution is, by one of its provisions, amendable. Let us, in that case correct, but not discard it.

But I am now to prove that the provision in question is not susceptible of the pro-slavery construction or meaning; or in other words, that it does not favor or countenance the recapture of fugitive slaves.

I will neither reject nor adopt any of the published views of this provision. I will pronounce them neither sound nor unsound. Among these views is, that:

It is a provision capable of innocent uses—such as the recovering of fugitive apprentices, minor children, &c. &c.

Nevertheless, it must be admitted that one, and the leading one, of the objects in bringing this provision into the Constitution, was to facilitate the retaking of fugitive slaves: and it must also be admitted that, if this object gives character and effect to the provision, the Constitution has a pro-slavery taint.

Another of these views is, that:

If it is a provision to promote the recovery of fugitive slaves, it is contrary to the Divine law, and is therefore null and void.

It is certainly true that, in such case, it is null and void, *in foro conscientiæ:* but whether it is consistent for him, who swears to support the Constitution, or who otherwise recognizes its validity, to admit even this much, remains a question.

The last of these views which I shall notice, is that:

The Constitution is to be understood as they who adopted it understood it; and that they looked upon the innocent face of this provision, and did not pry into the occult and guilty meaning, which is imputed to it.

There is certainly great force in this view. But, would there not also be great force in replying to it, that the framers of the Constitution were the agents of its adopters; and that these adopters are concluded by the evidences of what their agents intended to do, and actually did?

Conceding every doubtful ground, and confining myself to that which is certain, I admit that, on either of the two following conditions, the pro-slavery construction or meaning of the provision should prevail.

1st. If that construction, or meaning, is expressed in the provision.

2d. If it could have been: or in other words, if the framers and adopters of the Constitution would have suffered it to be expressed.

That the fact of these two conditions is unfulfilled, and that so far, therefore, the provision is not susceptible of the pro-slavery meaning, is abundantly manifest from two considerations. 1st. The provision speaks of "service or labor *due.*" But, by the definitions of the Southern slave codes, (and Southern slaveholders are of course included by those definitions,) the slave is a chattel; and hence, to predicate indebtedness of a slave, is, in the light of those definitions, as absurd as to predicate it of a horse, or a stone. 2d. The "Madison Papers" inform us, to use their own language precisely, that: "On motion of Mr. Randolph, the word 'servitude' was struck out, (by the Convention, from Article I. Section 2,) and 'service' unanimously inserted, the former being thought to express the condition of the slaves, and the latter the obligations of free persons."

We now proceed to the second condition. And I would here remark, for the purpose of abating any surprise at my extensive, perhaps too extensive, concession in this condition, that I made the concession because there is not a little collateral evidence that a part of the framers of the Constitution intended that the provision should carry the pro-slavery meaning; and that the remainder, if not also intending it, were, at least, willing to seem to intend it.

The question to be answered at this stage of our remarks is, whether the framers and adopters of the Constitution would have suffered the pro-slavery meaning of this provision to be expressed in it—to be distinctly, unambiguously expressed in it. Who can read the "Madison Papers," and in other ways also acquaint himself with the mind of the Convention which framed the Constitution, and yet believe that the Constitution would have suffered it? Who can believe that this Convention, which would not suffer the word "slave," or the word "slavery," or even the word "servitude," to have a place in the Constitution; which agreed with its Mr. Gerry, that it "ought to be careful not to give any sanction to Slavery;" and which, to use the very words of its leading member, Mr. Madison, on the floor of the Convention, "thought it wrong to admit in the Convention the idea that there could be property in man"—who, I say, can believe that this Convention would have consented to let the Constitution declare in plain, unequivocal terms, the right of the slaveholder to chase down, and to chase down unhindered, the poor innocent fugitive from Slavery? More difficult, however, it would be, for any one who has informed himself of the strong Anti-Slavery sentiment which then existed in almost every part of our country, to believe that the Constitution would have been adopted, had it so spoken.

I need say no more, to show what must be the answer to the question proposed at the beginning of my last paragraph. It must be prompt and decisive against those who would make a pro-slavery use of the Constitution. Hence, there is no more foundation in fact for the second, than for the first of the two conditions on which, and on either of which, I admitted the right of giving a pro-slavery construction to the provision in question.

That there is any other condition on which it is right to give the pro-slavery construction, I deny. It may be said that the pro-slavery intention of the provision, as gathered from collateral testimonies, should govern the interpretation of it. I admit, (and the admission is, perhaps, excessively liberal,) that it should, provided it (the intention) could have been expressed in the provision. But I maintain that if it could not—that if the moral sense of those who framed, and those who adopted the Constitution, would have revolted at, and forbidden such expression—that then these collateral testimonies are to have no weight whatever. To illustrate;—I will suppose that I have made a written contract with my neighbor, under which I claim that he has sold me a certain privilege. I seek to enforce my claim to that privilege, in a Court of Law. He resists. On the trial, I am constrained to admit, that I was aware that the idea of selling the privilege was deeply offensive and revolting to the moral sense of my neighbor; and that, in all probability, his execution of the contract could not have been obtained, had the contract described the privilege in plain terms, instead of attempting to describe it in circuitous and vague phraseology. In these circumstances, let me adduce what collateral evidence I may, that he intended to sell me the privilege, the Court will be steadfast against my claim to it:—and the more so if the contract, as is the case with the Constitutional provision in question, clearly expresses the right to certain other things;—and still the more so, if, as in that case, it wholly fails to describe the claimed privilege. Thus defeated, I might regret that I had not accosted my neighbor with a plain and direct proposition for the privilege:—for, possibly, he might have embraced it, and executed a contract expressive of it. But my regret would be unavailing. So, too, the pro-slavery party may now regret that it did not try those who framed, and those who adopted the Constitution, with a plain and direct proposition for the unmolested pursuit of runaway slaves. But, regret in this case, as well as in the other, would come too late. This party had its choice; and it chose to couch its guilty intention in circumlocution and obscurity, rather than risk defeat upon a direct and plain expression of it. Had it chosen the latter, it might possibly have succeeded—that is, it might possibly have succeeded in a bold, shameless attempt to reconcile the Convention and the people to such an expression. But to say that this party should benefit by the bare supposition of its possible success in a certain course—and that, too, when a contrary course was its actual choice—is the very height of absurdity.

I need say no more to show that the innocent meanings which lie on the face of this provision should not be supplanted by the guilty one which it is said to conceal. I need say no more to prove that this provision is to be construed as having no reference to slaves.

It is asked, why these views, of the correctness of which I am so confident, have not been entertained by our Courts of Law?—it is readily answered, that it is because those Courts are involved in the public sentiment of our country, and because this public sentiment is tyrannized over, debauched, bewitched, by Slavery. The Judges of our land, are as little able, and as little disposed, as the Clergymen of our land, to resist the authoritative commands and blinding influences of Slavery.

I am glad to see so many pens employed to vindicate the Constitution from the charge of being pro-slavery. It is an Anti-Slavery instrument; and needs but be administered in consistency with its principles, to effectuate the speedy overthrow of the whole system of American Slavery. It is a power in the hands of the People, which they cannot fling away, without making themselves guilty of ingratitude to God, and treason to the slave;—for God has given it to them, and the slave vitally needs their righteous use of it. It may cost them much toil, and self-denial, and vexation of spirit, to recover that power from the perversions, by which it has upheld and extended the dominion of Slavery:—but to all this they must submit; and the more readily because they have shared, and largely, too, in the guilt of those perversions. This shield, which God has given us to put over the head of the slave, we have traitorously made the protection of the slaveholder. This weapon, which God has given us for fighting the battles of the oppressed, we have murderously wielded on the side of the oppressor.

tion of the treaty; and these acts rendered it as valid and obligatory upon the United States, as if Congress had given assent, prior to the conclusion of the treaty. At the period of 1819, Texas, as claimed by us, was unpeopled. No hostile incursions had been made into it by citizens of the United States. In 1825 and 1827, there were but few inhabitants of Texas, consisting of some colonists, planted there under the authority of Mexico.

At neither of the three periods above mentioned had any State or section, in this Union, manifested any opposition to Texas composing a part of it. It has been said that Mr. Adams's administration offered to negotiate with Mexico for Texas, notwithstanding the existence of a war between Spain and Mexico, and that it could not therefore have believed that the acquisition of Texas, at that time, would have involved the United States in war with Spain.—Hence it is argued that the ratification of the late treaty could not have compromised our peace.

Mr. Adams thought it desirable to obtain Texas. Two foreign powers claimed it. Mexico was in possession, and Spain was doing nothing to assert and enforce her claim. Her representative had even gone so far as to stipulate, in a convention, to acknowledge the Independence of Mexico, although that convention was not ratified by Spain.

Mr. Adams had a right to authorize the negotiation of a treaty for the acquisition of Texas with both or either of the powers claiming it. It was natural that he should begin with that power which had the possession of Texas. Spain had interposed no obstacle. She had made no declaration that she would regard the acquisition of Texas as an act of war. In point of fact, no overture was formally made to Mexico to purchase Texas, no negotiation was opened, no treaty was concluded. If a negotiation had commenced, or if a treaty had been signed, and Spain had protested, the prudent and cautious policy which characterized Mr. Adams's administration, would undoubtedly have prompted him to quiet Spain, and accomodate the matter, previous to the annexation of Texas to the United States, and without plunging them in war with Spain. How totally different are all the circumstances under which, with Mr. Adams's authority, I authorized the overture to Mexico, from those which attended the recent treaty of Mr. Tyler.

So far from Mexico being silent, she repeatedly and solemnly declared that she would consider Annexation as war with her. Texas was no longer an uninhabited country. It had been wrested from the dominion of Mexico by citizens, many of whom went armed from the United States. The war between Mexico and Texas had not been terminated by any treaty of peace. Mr. Tyler not only did not consult Mexico, but he announced that her assent to the Annexation was altogether unnecessary. And he proceeded to conclude a treaty, embracing a large extent of territory, and a numerous population, not comprehended in the Texas which the United States ceded to Spain in 1819.

In the meantime, too, a powerful opposition had arisen in the United States against the Annexation of Texas to them. Several States had declared through their Legislatures, against it, and others, if not whole sections of the Union, were believed to be adverse to it. This was the opposition to the measure, to which, in my Raleigh letter, I alluded, when I spoke of a considerable portion of the *Confederacy*. I did not refer to persons, but to States or sections.

Under such circumstances I could not but regard the Annexation of Texas, at this time, as compromitting the honor of my country, involving it in a war, in which the sympathies of all Christendom would be against us, and endangering the integrity of the Union. I thought then, and still believe, that National dishonor, foreign war, and distraction, and division at home were too great sacrifices to make for the acquisition of Texas.

But, gentlemen, you are desirous of knowing by what policy I would be guided, in the event of my election as Chief Magistrate of the United States, in reference to the question of the Annexation of Texas. I do not think it right to announce in advance, what will be the course of a future administration in respect to a question with a foreign power. I have, however, no hesitation in saying that, far from having any personal objection to the Annexation of Texas, I should be glad to see it—without war, without dishonor, with the common consent of the Union, and upon just and fair terms.

I do not think that the subject of Slavery ought to affect the question, one way or the other. Whether Texas be independent, or incorporated in the United States I do not believe that it will prolong or shorten the duration of that institution. It is destined to become extinct at some distant day, in my opinion, by the operation of the inevitiable laws of population. It would be unwise to refuse a permanent acquisition which will exist as long as the globe remains, on account of a temporary institution.

In the contingency of my election to which you have adverted, if the affair of acquiring Texas should become a subject of consideration, I should be governed by the state of fact and the state of public opinion existing at the time I might be called upon to act. Above all, I should be governed by the paramount duty of preserving the Union entire, and in harmony, regarding it, as I do, as the great guaranty of every political and public blessing, under Providence, which as a free people we are permitted to enjoy. I am, gentlemen, respectfully,

Your odedient servant,

H. CLAY.

Messrs. THOMAS M. PETERS and JOHN M. JACKSON.

Communications.

LETTER FROM PROFESSOR CLEVELAND.

To the Editor of the Anti-Slavery Standard:

SIR:—On my return to the city, after a short absence, a friend has showed me the accounts of the late meeting of the Anti-Slavery Society at Norristown, as published in the "Standard," and "Pennsylvania Freeman." In them I see that my humble name has been often introduced, certainly not in the kindest spirit, and in a manner calculated to produce wrong impressions. Most of these things, however, I cannot notice. But there is one statement so entirely untrue, that, even though it appears in the "Standard," I feel it my duty to correct it.

In the account given of the Liberty Party meeting, held in the lecture-room of the church, the following language is used: "Professor Cleveland, who was the Chairman, said that he had certain letters to read to the meeting, but which he could not do, inasmuch as there were persons, or a person, present, before whom they could not be read."

Now, *I said no such thing*. After some business had been transacted, I rose and said, in these, or nearly these very words: "That I had received some letters, directed to myself, from a few friends abroad, and presuming that all present were friends of our cause, I would read a few extracts if agreeable to the meeting. I was about to do so, when, a lady, in a distant part of the room, rose, and said that she was not friendly to the Liberty Party, but that she had been invited there, and that she came to take notes of our proceedings. *That lady I did not then know*, having never, to my knowledge, seen her before; and when I first saw her there, I presumed she was the wife of some one of our country friends. I was immediately told her name by the Secretary; and on her saying that she would retire if desired, I said, at once, that I hoped, by all means, she would keep her seat, and I was immediately joined in this wish by other members of the Convention.

Now, how indelicate, how improper, yes, how insulting would it have been, for me, had I seen *any* one present whom I knew to be unfriendly to us, especially had I seen *a lady* whom I knew to be such, to have said, as the "Standard" reports me, that "there were persons, or a person, before whom they (the letters) could not be read."

Let me merely add, that it is the farthest from my intention, to charge this incorrect statement upon the lady in question. I do not believe her capable of such a thing; and though not present when this incident was the subject of remark, at the last day of the meeting at Norristown, I have been told by those who were there, that she stated correctly what I had said. As far as I or my friends are concerned, I would not be at the pains to correct even this mis statement, great as it is; but I do it now, lest a cause which it so dear to me, should suffer in the minds of those who do not know me.

With due respect, yours.

C. D. CLEVELAND.

PHILADELPHIA, August 29, 1844.

THE "NO-VOTING THEORY."—No. 2.

The object of this number is to notice the reply of Wendell Phillips, contained in the Standard of July 11th, to my former article on the "No-Voting Theory."

Mr. Phillips states his doctrine very clearly. It is, that "Government is a connected whole,—a chain of unbroken links," that to take any part in such a Government, by voting, when I think any of the laws wrong, is to join others in doing what I think wrong, and is therefore sinful.

My doctrine, on the contrary, is, that the Creator has made Government necessary to the welfare, perhaps even to the existence, of man. It is as necessary as clothing, or as dwelling-houses. But it is impossible, by reason of the diversity of human judgments, to make a Constitution and code of laws, which will not be deemed wrong in some one or other of their branches, by almost every individual in the community;—for one law will be passed by a majority composed of one set of individuals, another law by a majority composed partly of those who opposed the other law, and so on, indefinitely. Hence, it is no moral wrong,—it is no sin, for me to sustain the Government, and participate in it, although I do not approve of all which it does. We must choose between this and the abrogation of all government; and it is our duty to select the least of those inevitable evils between which we are compelled to choose.

Hence, when Mr. Phillips asks, "how much *sin* does God authorize us to commit, in order to sustain the nature of man;"—and when he speaks of my weighing sin against the nature of man, and finding the former kick the beam;—he departs from the point in issue;—he begs the question of its being a sin to participate in the Government, instead of proving that it is so; and he assumes that I have admitted it to be so, in all cases where the Government does any wrong, when in reality, instead of admitting it, I expressly denied it.

When he says that I argue "that Government cannot exist, without the mass of the people, each one, consenting to do something he thinks *wrong*," and intimates that I wish us to smother our moral convictions," in order to have a Government, he plays upon words, and misstates my sentiments, doubtless unintentionally.

The play upon words consists in using the expression, "do something which he thinks wrong," the word "wrong" being sometimes used in reference to the abstract nature of an act; and sometimes in reference to its nature, when taken in connection with all the attendant circumstances. I held, that what was wrong to be done under certain circumstances, would become right to be done under other circumstances;—and this is no more than what Mr. Phillips himself asserts to be true. He admits that, as a general rule, it is wrong for him to put his hand in his pocket, take out money, and hand it to another, to be employed in paying for arresting fugitive slaves, or for putting down slave-insurrections. Yet, when the tax-gatherer comes and threatens him with a seizure of his property if he does not do that act, then he holds that it becomes right to do what, as a general rule, he had admitted to be wrong. He holds that it becomes right, from the peculiar circumstances in which he is placed. And it is utterly impossible for him to defend it on any principles which will not justify me in voting.

I may, therefore, with as much propriety charge upon him the wishing of each one to consent to do something he thinks wrong, and to smother his moral convictions, as he can charge it upon me. The truth is, that he does not smother his moral convictions, when he pays a tax which goes to support Slavery, nor I mine, when I give a vote which goes to abolish Slavery.

The intimation that I hold Government to be "necessarily based on sin," and "that it cannot exist unless every man stifle somewhat of his conscience," is equally a misstatement of my views. I hold to neither position. But I do hold that Government is necessarily based on the principle that those who participate in it, to the extent that both Mr. Phillips and myself do, should do that which they would think a sin for them to do, and which they could not do without stifling conscience, if they alone had the absolute control of human affairs, but which is no sin, and no stifling of conscience, as circumstances exist. This position I prove by the fact, that Mr. Phillips, and all other conscientious tax-payers, under this and every other Government, do that in paying their taxes, which it would be sinful for them to do, if they had the absolute control of human affairs.

Again; he intimates, that I suppose, that "to sustain Government, we must sacrifice honesty." I supposed nothing of the kind; but I do suppose honesty to consist in doing that, which under existing circumstances, is most for the welfare of our whole race, and that the welfare of the race is more promoted by establishing and sustaining the best government we can get, and improving it whenever we can, by means which do not produce more injury than benefit, than it is by refusing to establish or participate in any Government whatever, because we cannot obtain one exactly as we would think it our duty to establish if we possessed all power. Thus, my real position is, that if we sacrifice Government, we must sacrifice honesty.

Mr. Phillips asserts that his theory would not put an end to Government, inasmuch as he avers that it is practicable for the bulk of the people to frame a code of laws upon which they "can in every part *conscientiously* agree." If he means that they can conscientiously agree to support it as a whole, although they disapprove of particular parts, then I admit it, for it is precisely what I assert that mankind will do, and ought to do. But if he means, as I presume he does, that the great bulk of the people can each one of them be brought to be in favor of the adoption or continuance of every one of a general code of laws, or to think that every one of the laws is such as a true sense of justice would dictate then I assert that it is utterly impossible.

In support of this position, Mr. Phillips cites the great numbers who have believed every one of the Thirty-nine articles of the Episcopal Church, or of the five points of Calvin. I doubt that a majority of any nation have ever believed in all of either creed, especially where freedom of speech, the press, and religion, has existed. It is known that many who belong to the churches that hold those dogmas, do not themselves believe in them all; and certainly not one-tenth of the people of this country do so. Moreover, these dogmas have been received in the allegation of express revelation, which is not applicable to the mass of the laws. And the laws, instead of being confined to five points, or to thirty-nine, extend to a thousand. Mr. Phillips thinks it would be a *ludicrous* exaggeration to suppose that 30,000 out of the 130,000 voters of Massachusetts, entertain any conscientious scruples as to any point in her State Constitution, or her Revised Statutes. I think that it would be a gross exaggeration, whether ludicrous or not, to suppose that there were ten men of common sense in the State, that would not entertain such scruples, if the adoption or rejection of all those laws were left to the sole decision of each one of them; or ten men who would not entertain scruples about participating in the Massachusetts Government, though separated from the Union, if they held to the doctrine on which the "no-voting theory" is based. The arguments, therefore, fail to establish the position.

What proof, on the contrary, have I to establish the position that the majority could never agree on a code of laws, every item of which would be just and right in the opinion of every member of that majority? I have first the fact, that in Congress, and the State Legislatures, it is rare that any two members are found voting together on every question, although only a very small portion of the legislation of the country passes in review before them;—the fact, that the Democratic and Whig parties never agree, and you will rarely find a Whig or a Democrat who does not, on some point, dissent from the mass of his own party;—and the fact, that as far as known experiment has tested the question, no two men have ever been found who could agree on every point of legislation. When my friend has found one man with whom he can so agree, then I will admit that he has made one little step towards establishing his theory.

Shall I be told that there is a difference between things merely inexpedient, and those which are morally wrong; and that differences of opinion principally relate to questions of expediency? If so, I reply, that, in *compulsory* regulations, everything which is inexpedient, is unjust; and everything which is unjust, is morally wrong in the person who believes it to be unjust. Waving this point, however, I am satisfied that a majority of those who hold that there is a distinction, in legislation, between inexpediency and moral wrong, could never agree among themselves on every point, as to what it would be morally wrong to permit, to command, and to prohibit.

Suppose, however, a majority could be found to agree in opinion on every item of a code of laws, let us see whether the government which Mr. Phillips proposes to adopt, is practicable, and if practicable, whether the remedy is not worse than the disease. His plan is, that all those who think any one feature of any one or more of all the laws, is wrong, should withdraw altogether from the Government, until, by moral influence, they should have converted enough to make up a majority, and that then they should forthwith set up a separate Government in opposition to the old one, and by force, if necessary, subdue the old Government, and all its adherents; and this they are to do under the sanction of the Declaration of Independence. The first difficulty in the way is, that a large number do not admit the soundness of the theory of the Declaration, as construed by Mr. Phillips. Thomas Wilson Dorr is in the Penitentiary for life, for acting on it; and President Tyler declared, in a late message to Congress, that he utterly rejected it. We know, also, that the rulers of South Carolina, of Britain, of France, and of most countries, refuse to acknowledge it; and that the possession of power gives such advantages, that the majority are unable, by force, to overturn the Government, though, if they were allowed access to the ballot-box, they might do it, unless prevented by the "no-voting theory." I doubt whether the non-voting Abolitionists will, one in ten, approve of this mode of reforming Government by violence, and I feel sure that not one in ten of those who do vote, would approve of violence as the first remedy, before the ballot-box had been tried. I doubt whether Mr. Phillips himself, in suggesting it, intended to express approval of it, or whether he would think it better than the present mode of operation. If, then, it is a scheme of Government so bad that nobody will resort to it, and nobody will think it better than the present usage, we shall come back to the position that we must have no government at all, or reject the non-voting theory, or do still worse.

Suppose, however, that we could do,—what at present appears hopeless,—induce all to agree to abide the will of the majority, however expressed; then I ask for a description of the machinery by which it is to be ascertained, and when, and how often it is to be ascertained, that a majority are opposed to some portion of the existing laws, and how it is to be ascertained precisely which portion they are opposed to, and which not; and how it is to be ascertained, when a majority are opposed to a part of the existing laws, that there will be a majority in favor of the whole of another code, and what that other code must be, in every one of its features, so as to satisfy the majority? It might be easy to ascertain that a majority disapproved of the existing code, some persons of one, and some of another part of it; but how to ascertain, without immense machinery, and oft-repeated direct votes of the whole people, that a majority could agree on any entire new code, and what that code could be, I cannot perceive. And even when it was ascertained, a month would probably not pass away before there would be so many converts to the opinion that the new code was wrong in one little point, that it would cease to have a majority of supporters. And then the same process must be gone through again, not merely of repealing one item of the existing code, but of ascertaining what entire new code could command, in every feature, the approbation of a majority. And how would this machinery be worked, and by whose authority? If by authority of the existing Government, and with officers appointed by it, and at its expense, then the dissatisfied majority could not act for the purpose of reform; for to do so would be to vote under the Government, and to sanction it as a whole, according to the doctrine. And if the reform is not effected by authority of the existing Government, how is it to be settled whether a real majority, in a great nation, are in favor of the new code? We know it is disputed whether Governor Dorr had a majority with him or not, and I suspect the non-voting Abolitionists would differ among themselves on this question.

Mr. Phillips says, in reference to my former article, that I suppose "that the ballot-box is the only means of political influence," and "that every man should actually vote, in order to influence his times." This is a mistake. I never supposed anything of the kind, nor found any person who did. Nor did I ever, as was intimated in the Standard of the preceding week, doubt the efficacy of moral power, or find any person who did doubt it. Moral power leads to physical action; and physical action feeds the hungry, clothes the naked, reforms the Government, and emancipates the slave. Moral power is of two kinds. 1st. Precept with appropriate argument. 2d. Example. He who teaches that Slavery is wrong, that it is right to emancipate, and right to vote for emancipation, uses the moral power of precept. He who, though in a minority, votes for abolition candidates to amend the Constitution and laws, uses the moral power of example. I think I have far more confidence in the efficacy of moral power, than is manifested in the arguments which have been published in the Standard, in favor of Dissolution and the "no-voting theory." I think the non-voters will do much good, because they will persuade many that to support Slavery is wrong, while they will persuade but few, that to vote is to support Slavery. If they could convince all of the latter position, who should be convinced of the former, then I should think they would do far more harm than good. But it is happily true, that the people will adopt a part of their sentiments, and reject the other part.

Mr. Phillips says that "the little band of Democrats who left Rome, and encamped on the *Mons Sacer* outside, then understood their interests better than when they were mixed up, and voting with their masters shoulder to shoulder!" I think the band was not so very *little*. If it had been, it would have effected nothing,—moreover, the case is not analagous to that of our non-voters; first, because ours do not leave the country as those did the city: secondly, because ours do not cease compliance with the exactions of the Government as those Romans did: and thirdly, because those Romans did not withdraw from the enjoyment of a nearly equal right of suffrage with those who ruled amiss, but the very object of their withdrawal was to obtain that nearly equal right of suffrage, or its equivalent, which our non-voters refuse to accept when offered to them.

My friend speaks as if I had undertaken to show that non-voters ought not to bring suits, or pay taxes. If he will examine my communication he will find that I undertook nothing of the sort. I undertook to show that the doctrine of "no union with slaveholders" and of no support of Slavery, through acts which we can avoid by incurring a greater evil, would lead to the abandonment of bringing suits, and paying taxes. And inasmuch as the common sense, even of the non-voters themselves, revolted against carrying out their principle, either in theory or in practice, to its legitimate consequences, I inferred that the principle itself must be wrong; for that principle, against the practical application of which all mankind revolt, must be an unsound one.

He undertakes to defend the bringing of suits by one who is opposed in part to the Government, by alledging that he may rightfully avail himself of any opportunity which the makers and upholders of the whole system of Government offer to him, of enabling him to compel them to do justice, in one respect, though they will not do it in all respects. I will not deny the allegation: yet it appears to me that we may as well apply to the makers of a Government which we disapproved, through the ballot-box as through a Court, for so much justice as they will give us an opportunity of obtaining. But this suing before a Judge who holds his place only by virtue of an oath to support the Constitution, and whose process to compel to compel justice is enforced through the aid of slaveholders, does not appear to me consistent with the doctrine of no union with the slaveholders, and no striking of hands with them. I admit that he who sues before a Judge does not thereby recognize the rightfulness of every part of that Constitution which the Judge is sworn to sustain, but he certainly comes as near recognizing it as he does who votes for the express purpose of changing the Constitution.

But Mr. Phillips has not met the point that I raised. He says that I do not raise the point whether one non-voter can properly sue another. This is a mistake. I did raise that point, and also that of suing aliens. I spoke of the practice of suing, indiscriminately, men, women, minors, and aliens without inquiring whether they admitted or denied the rightfulness of Slavery, which practice all, who sue at all, pursue. Now I ask, is not this practice an acknowledgment of the present Government, as much as voting? And I ask whether my friend will seriously hold that it is right to sue a person after we have ascertained that he votes, but wrong to sue all others? And while asking questions, I would inquire whether he means seriously to approve and recommend the system of Government which he has suggested, and of which I have before treated?

We could hardly wish a stronger argument against the "no-voting theory" than the fact that its advocates should find it necessary to propose, first, that with every new law there should be a new set of citizens and voters introduced, and an old set discharged; that a frequent, if not the usual mode of legislation, should be through rebellion and conquest, unless the existing Government would abdicate voluntarily; and that it would be proper to sue those who voluntarily become and remain members of the Government, but improper to sue any others, and of course that it would be necessary to ascertain the present views and intentions of an individual in reference to the Government, in order to ascertain whether we might rightfully bring a suit against him or not.

Mr. Phillips challenges me to produce any respectable writer on law who maintains that an alien recognizes the rightfulness of a Government by suing under it. I, in turn, ask him to produce any respectable writer on law or on ethics, who maintains that a native of a country recognizes the entire rightfulness of its Government by voting under it.

He says that the distinction between paying taxes and letting the Government collect them by force, is a distinction without a difference. I reply, that it may be, in ordinary cases, a distinction without a difference in point of morality, but it is not so in point of fact, and any argument which will go to show the morality to be the same, will go equally well to prove that there is no difference in morality between submitting to the Government without voting, and submitting to it through voting, or if there be any difference that the latter is the most moral, because it produces less evil on the whole.

He says that my "talk about the collection of a tax being a penalty, and not the *payment* of it, does not," in his opinion, "rise even to the dignity of a legal quibble." And yet I know that some of the most distinguished non-voting Abolitionists hold precisely the same sentiment which is thus derided. I know that the Society of Friends have held it, and incorporated it into their discipline for centuries, and that they expel their members who do not conform to it. And I doubt not, that Mr. Phillips himself, and nine-tenths of the other adherents to the "non-voting theory," would adopt the same sentiment, and act upon it, in a case that might be presented. Suppose our Government were to lay an annual tax of six cents on each individual, to be appropriated exclusively, either to importing slaves from Africa, or to protecting and encouraging the slave-trade in that country, and that if any one refused to pay the tax, his property, either to the precise amount, or to precisely double the amount, and no more, was to be taken by the tax-gatherer,—would not, in that case, both Mr. Phillips and his co-professors refuse to pay the tax, and submit to the penalty of having their property seized, so that they knew they could lose no more than six cents per annum, each, by refusing to pay?

Charles C. Burleigh, in a late number of the Pennsylvania Freeman, has placed this question on what I conceive to be the true ground. It is this: that we are to decide whether we will pay the tax, or refuse, according as we believe the good of the whole human family will be most promoted by the one course or the other. And this mode of reasoning fully justifies voting in those who believe it best in its ultimate results.

Mr. Phillips asks "When any sane man concluded that our Saviour's voluntary payment of a tax, acknowledged the rightfulness of Rome's authority over Judea?" I ask him, in return, when any sane man, previous to 1835, concluded that a vote given at an election was an acknowledgment of the rightfulness, and a sanction of the continuance of every tittle of the Constitution and laws of the country?

He excuses, if I understand him, the payment of taxes to support Slavery, on the ground that if he does not pay, then the Government will take an equal amount out of his property. But how will he excuse it in a person whose property is in cash, and to whom the alternative is presented of paying or going to prison? He can excuse it only by averring that the individual is not bound to suffer so great an evil to himself, for the sake of so slight a benefit to the slave:—so I excuse voting, on the ground that the voter is not bound to suffer so great an evil both to himself and the slave, as the loss of his vote, for the sake of no benefit to anybody.

He justifies importing goods and giving a written promise at the Custom House to pay money to sustain Slavery, on the ground that importing is rightful in itself, and that he has a right to promise to support Slavery to save his goods from confiscation. But he admits that voting also is right in itself. If so, the representative has as much right to promise to support Slavery, to avoid the loss of his office, as Mr. Phillips has to make a like promise, to avoid the loss of his goods, if the support is no greater in proportion to the evil to be shunned in the one case than in the other. He says he is not obliged to resort to smuggling in order to avoid the support of Slavery. If so, I am not obliged to resort to rebellion in order to overthrow laws, which I can overthrow only in that way, or through the ballot-box. He says, that when he imports goods, after taxation, against his consent, cannot make it wrong. So, when I vote, the after exaction of the oath from my representative, against my consent, cannot make my vote wrong. If he says I knew beforehand that the oath would be exacted, I reply that he equally knew beforehand that the tax would be exacted.

He says that voting is like presenting to one who has got his enemy down a finely tempered dagger. I reply, that tax paying is the presentation of the dagger, but voting for Abolitionists, is the blunting of the dagger's point, and rendering it harmless.

He assumes that voting is appointing a person our agent, with an express view to sustain Slavery, but that importing goods and paying duties, is acting with a view to our own comfort, and that the support of Slavery is merely incidental. I answer, that the support of Slavery, if any, is as merely incidental in the former case as in the latter. In fact it is less intentional, for the abolition voter intends to destroy Slavery through his vote; but the importer intends to do acts which he knows will sustain it. If the *sole* duty of the officer voted for were to support Slavery, then there might be reason in the position; but he is chosen for other purposes, and there is a possibility that he may be called upon to support Slavery, coupled with a certainty that he can do more to overthrow, than he may be required to do to sustain it. But when Mr. Phillips imports, he knows that he will be required to support Slavery if he does so; thus the act innocent in itself, is rendered more palpably criminal, if either be criminal, than my act in voting when I know my representative may, by a remote possibility be called on to support Slavery.

He says that the voter consents that his representative shall sustain Slavery, because he knew it would [might] be his duty. I say he no more consents to it than the importer consents to it, by placing his goods where he knows it will be the duty of the collector to levy the tax. He says it must be supposed that the voter *intended* that his agent should support Slavery. I aver that this is not so supposable as it is that the importer *intended*, himself, to support it.

He says that we vote as sovereigns and pay taxes as subjects. I aver that we do not vote as absolute sovereigns, but as subjects invested with limited power. Our voting is like that of slaves, whose master allows them to choose their overseer. By doing so, they neither sanction his authority, nor promise not to escape from Slavery.

He says that he does not trade for the *purpose* of paying taxes: neither do I vote for the *purpose* of sustaining Slavery. He says that he is not obliged to abandon this country because by remaining in it, he will be compelled to support Slavery: if so, then I am not bound to abandon all that renders this country preferable to others, viz: the ballot-box, even though the use of it would compel me to support Slavery, which I do not admit to be the case. He says that the vote of the New England Convention was ten to one in favor of his theory. I reply that the Abolitionists of New England are one hundred to one, and the people at large, one thousand to one, against it.

That theory is founded upon a supposition, as to the intent, the declaration, and the obligation which a voter holds, makes, and assumes, by the mere act of voting, which supposition is not sanctioned by a single author on politics or morals,—which is not entertained by a single one of all the voters of the country, and which was never entertained by Mr. Phillips himself, until he had listened to and partially imbibed the novel doctrine upon which our friend Henry C. Wright ingeniously bases the structure of non-resistance.

E.

The Anti-Slavery Standard.

NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, SEPT. 12, 1844.

Take Notice.—There is a paper published in this city, called the New-York Standard, and letters and papers intended for us, often get miscarried to that office. Our friends and correspondents will please be sure and direct to us, as the *Anti-Slavery* Standard.

THE CHURCH.

We want, said a friend in a recent conversation, more of "the A. B. C. of abolitionism." We are not understood, and in dwelling so constantly upon the more advanced ideas which have become familiar to us, we forget that others have to learn their first lesson in Anti-Slavery, and in seeking light, receive that only which blinds because its brightness dazzles their mental and spiritual vision. We ourselves advanced step by step to our present position, and the same progressive process is necessary for others whom we would have climb the same ascent. There is doubtless a measure of truth in this; but one important fact is forgotten, namely, that the necessity of our apparently slow progress lay not so much in any inability in our minds, to receive at once the whole truth, as in the circumstance of our ignorance that in this or that institution we should find an obstacle to the progress of the cause, and the consequent necessity of taking gradually higher and higher ground, and so coming to the whole truth, as these obstacles multiplied, and presented themselves in hostile array against us. Our object is now universally understood to be the abolition of chattel slavery, and our first principle, that Slavery is wrong, is as universally acknowledged to be true. *How* the object is to be accomplished is the important question, and the necessity of the measures to be used, the people are just as capable of being made to comprehend now, as fourteen years ago they were the truths that Garrison then promulgated.

The mistake is in supposing that others are to be brought to our present position by the same outward experience that we have passed through. The progress of the cause with them is to be historical, not experimental, and they are just as able to appreciate its advanced condition by an exercise of the mind, as any other facts of history. That experience of the past is continually presented as our present position is shown, and he must be dull indeed who cannot see the sequence of cause and effect which has made that present position not a choice only but a necessity also. The blindness that does not see it is of the kind that will not choose to see, for such persons will very commonly be found to be those who profess to complain of a want of knowledge, because they wish to escape a duty which the knowledge would impose upon them.

No position, however, ever taken by the Abolitionists, has been more misrepresented, and more misunderstood than that in relation to the Church. And this was the most natural thing in the world, for no institution can be so deeply and firmly founded in the affections of the people; and when assailed, it is natural that it should be defended with all the fervid zeal which belongs to things deemed sacred, and every possible instrumentality used, even to the last poor, and ineffectual, and desperate one of lying, by men who think that a cherished order,—which has outgrown its true purpose and usefulness, though they may not see it—is about to be destroyed. There is, perhaps, therefore, more necessity for frequent explanation in this matter than any other.

There is something in the air sometimes which warns men, they knew not why—which seems to act not upon their reason, but their instincts—that danger is at hand. The preaching of Anti-Slavery truth has had this effect. As the sphere of action widened, and the views of its advocates become more enlarged, as new revelations were constantly, though gradually, made to them, and their relations to the institutions by which they were surrounded, plainly shown, it has been made clearly manifest that the Church was a dead church,—the form of the past wherein there was no true life—a form from which the virtue had departed,—a symbol, the meaning whereof was lost and forgotten. Men's religion was seen to consist of their belief, and not of their life,—a something which it was reputable to have a certain quantity of, for it gave its possessor a certain influence on 'Change, and in the office, and in the workshop, and was, therefore, so much vested capital in his merchandise or his profession, but whose golden precepts, which men in times past had made their lives, had nothing to do now with their every day affairs;—an abstract belief in certain dogmas and forms, which were thought of and put on with their Sunday clothes, but kept clean from the dust and toil of common life. The first day of the week was given to God, if long prayers, and longer faces, and "appearing unto men to fast," could so give it, and it was verily thought it was, but the other six days were given by common consent to the devil. And when deliverance to the captive, and the opening of the prison doors to those who are in bonds was proclaimed, the aid of the Church, that claimed to be the Church of Christ, was demanded, and it was found that there was not virtue nor valor enough in her to do this work for humanity; it was seen also by many, that she was, not for this time only, of the dead past, and that the age demanded, if its new awakening to the great and beautiful truth of the brotherhood of the race, a new Form, wherewith to clothe its life. This tendency of the age to strip itself of all shams, whether sacred or profane, could not but alarm those who saw really, or those whom selfishness caused to see, in the sham itself the reality for which it once stood. And so the Priests and the Pharisees cried out as of old, "He blasphemes!" and honest men very often believed them, for men cling always to the old, and cannot easily believe a new saying, let it be never so beautiful and true.

Yet the destruction of the Church never was, and is not now, the purpose of the Abolitionists, nor could the progress of their cause of itself, have ever accomplished such an end, had it been entertained. If the Church is in danger, she must look for its origin in causes that lie deeper down even than the anti-slavery sentiment, though that may have, as it undoubtedly has, done much to awaken the people to a true knowledge of her position. By many who have drawn their life from her bosom, she was looked to as the great and certain instrumentality whereby this, as all other good works, was to be accomplished. It was with grieved and reluctant spirits that they learned that in her was no hope for the slave, and that for her life she dare not expose this hideous wrong, which with her pontifical robes, and in the shadow of her rites and ceremonies,—mummeries, when the light of the true spirit has left them—she had so long covered up, lest by so doing, she acknowledge her own sin, and raise the veil which should expose to the light of day her own unworthiness and hypocrisy.

The course of the Abolitionists has been a very plain one. They knew that millions of their countrymen were deprived of all the rights which belong to humanity, and which make life worth the having. They knew that labor was deprived of its just reward, and the laborer condemned to live in a condition little better than that of the brute; that to these millions the marriage-tie was denied, and that women were compelled to live in a state of indiscriminate concubinage; that the holiest and best affections of the human heart were every moment outraged in one half the land; that the cradle was robbed of the young infant, and the child torn from its mother's bosom, that she or it should be sold in the men-shambles, to satisfy the cupidity of the dealers in human flesh; that spiritual and intellectual light was shut out from these darkened minds, or only given in such small measure as to enable them better to perform only their allotted tasks as human brutes; and that by a retributive justice the wrong-doer was becoming,—had indeed become—the slave of his own vices, the victim of the evils which he had himself engendered. They raised their voices against this great iniquity, and declaring Slavery to be a sin in the sight of God, demanded in the name of God and man, its *immediate abolition*. And what answered the religion of the land, embodied in the Church? She gave no answer, till compelled by the earnest tone that would not be silenced, and the indignant remonstrance at her supineness that would be heard, she at length aroused herself, but only to oppose. No new principle was attempted to be forced upon her; the dogmas of each particular sect were by no one word disputed; it was only asked that each and all should apply the common principles by which all professed to be governed, to this "sum of all villanies;" and each and all with one accord, true to the instinct of self-preservation, and the various interests which bound them by so many ties to the support of the slave-system, and false to the plainest rules of Christian life, and the most undisputed of the precepts of Jesus, arranged themselves on the side of the oppressor, and threw into the scale of tyranny the whole influence of the body which gives the religious life and teaching to the people, and settles the question of right and wrong, of good and evil, of true and untrue, for the world. At the altar of the Church, then, let the sin lie. If Slavery can be perpetuated, she would gladly do it. To the Abolitionist she has left no alternative but to condemn her with the wrong which she protects and nourishes in her own bosom; and let God be thanked, that as Truth is mightier than her opponents, though the sanctity of religion shall have made them venerable and honored, yet shall she in the end triumph, though it be over the ruins of the Church—G.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

CONSTITUTIONAL ARGUMENT, AGAINST AMERICAN SLAVERY. By Gerrit Smith. Utica, N. Y. Jackson & Chaplin, 1844: pp. 16.

[Omitted, for want of room, from last week's paper.]

This is the title of a tract lately published by Mr. Gerrit Smith, to prove the Constitution of the United States to be an *Anti-Slavery* instrument. It is a choice specimen of that species of reasoning, vulgarly but expressively denominated, "arguing a man's nose off his face." Mr. Smith must have strong faith in the power of words, if he think that he can talk off the main and prominent feature of the Constitution, which all the world sees, excepting those who will shut their eyes, to be as conspicuous as the nose of the hero of Slawkenbergius's tale. There is nothing particularly new in Mr. Smith's positions and arguments. They have been assumed and argued in all the discussions on the subject, and as often demolished. They are not much more creditable to his own ingenuity, than they are to the common sense of those for whose benefit they are intended. A brief statement of his points will be all the refutation they will need.

Mr. Smith asks with much simplicity, "Why should Northern slaveholders disdain connection with Southern slaveholders?" Simply because they wish to cease to be slaveholders,—and perceive that this is the most direct, if not the only, way of ceasing from their guilt. In contemplation of this project of Disunion, Mr. Smith is "led to ask, with *Mr. Webster*, where shall *I* go?" and to find his answer in the words of *Mr. Gurley*, "I go with the South!" Surely, Third Party, like misery, brings men acquainted with strange bedfellows.

Mr. Smith thinks it wrong to call the Constitution a pro-slavery instrument, because the *word* Slavery is not contained in it; although the *thing* has been found there any time these fifty years, by Congress, Courts, and people, and all who had occasion for it. This is something as if a subtle casuist should undertake to deny the existence of the handle to the countenance of Slawkenbergius's hero aforesaid, because he had seen fit to bury it in his pocket-handkerchief.

Mr. Smith says, "The provision respecting the African slave-trade, (for, I admit, that, if, not exclusively, it, nevertheless, respects that,)" I quote his own words, though I do not fully understand the parenthesis,—"is to be regarded as *anti-slavery* because it is a part of an *anti-slavery* agreement!" That is to say, a contract made between two parties that neither shall molest the other in piracy, robbery and murder, for twenty years, is an *honest* contract! I am not sure that I did not do Mr. Smith injustice in saying that there was nothing particularly new in his positions. I incline to think that this one *is* particularly new. He should not, however, have suffered his partisan zeal so to outrun his regard for truth, as to misrepresent the nature of the clause in question. He says, that the agreement was, "*that the trade should be discontinued after nineteen years*;" whereas it was, that *it should not be prohibited before* that time; which is a very different thing. The trade might have been continued to this day, under the Constitution; aye, and would have been, had not the domestic manufacture been found more profitable than the free trade.

Mr. Smith is of opinion that there is no evidence whatever, that the clause respecting the apportionment of representatives *was designed to promote slavery*; on the contrary, it is *a bounty on liberty*; and should rather be charged with *seeking to promote the Anti-Slavery cause!*

He also thinks the provisions respecting "insurrections" and "domestic violence," neither *pro-slavery* nor *anti-slavery?* They only "stand in the way of the *lawless and violent* abolition of Slavery!" Does Mr. Smith and his party regard the vindication of liberty by an appeal to arms, and the God of Battles, *lawless* or wrong in itself? Do they repudiate the American Revolution? If they do not, will they elect a President whose business it is to put down a Southern revolution by the sword of the nation? Or will they instruct him to swear that he will do so, with the intention of refusing to perform his sworn duty, when it is required of him?

Finally, Mr. Smith thinks that the clause requiring the delivery of "persons held to service or labor," "*is not susceptible of the pro-slavery construction or meaning; or, in other words, that it does not favor, or countenance, the recapture of fugitive slaves!*" To be sure, he thinks it of no great consequence if it did, because, such is the Northern anti-slavery sentiment, that "not *ten in a thousand* of the runaway slaves, who now reach a free State, are replunged into Slavery!" This may be satisfactory to Mr. Smith and his friends, but he may be assured that there are men who look upon liberty as so comely and precious a thing, that they deem the enslaving of *one man* enough to call down the vengeance of Heaven and the justice of man upon any Government that tolerates it. Mr. Smith rests his argument on two grounds. 1st. That the pro-slavery construction, or meaning, is not expressed in the provision;—it speaking of service and labor *due;* and the Madison Papers informing us, "that on motion of Mr. Randolph, the word '*servitude*' was struck out, and '*service*' unanimously inserted; the former being thought to express the condition of slaves, and the latter the obligations of free persons." Mr. Smith passes by the other passages in the Madison Papers, showing the *animus* of the Convention as to Slavery. 2d. "The framers and adopters of the Constitution would not have suffered it to have been expressed." That is because the framers of the Constitution had regard enough for decency to be unwilling that its phraseology should be worse than they thought sufficient, as it has proved, for their purposes, therefore, it does not mean what common sense and judicial decisions have united for fifty years in saying that it does mean. Mr. Smith admits that "there is not a little collateral evidence that *a part*" (does he believe that there was *one* who did not intend it?) "of the framers of the Constitution intended that the provision should carry the pro-slavery meaning; and that the remainder, *if not also intending it*, were, at least, willing *to seem to intend it!*" The intention of thelawgiver, at the time of making the law, Blackstone tells us, is one of the most authentic rules of interpretation in doubtful cases. Was not their intention plain enough? Mr. Smith appeals to the Madison Papers to show that the Convention would not have suffered the pro-slavery meaning of this clause to be distinctly *expressed* in the Constitution. Do not those papers show most conclusively that the Convention would never have adopted it, had not the pro-slavery meaning been most distinctly *understood?* Mr. Smith passes over, in the most remarkable manner, the construction which the Supreme Court of the United States has given to this clause. He does not seem to know that that construction is as binding as if it were expressed in their words in the Constitution itself, upon all official functionaries. All he has to say on this insignificant point is, that the decisions of the Courts are owing to the pro-slavery character, not of the Constitution, but of the people! His silence on this point reminds one of the performance of Hamlet, with the part of Hamlet omitted by particular desire.

While Mr. Smith was in a logical vein, it is a little remarkable that he did not go a step farther, and prove, (as he might have done, by almost the same arguments,) that there exists *no slavery at all in the United States.* This would settle the matter at once and forever, and save an infinity of trouble. To be sure, it would destroy the Third Political Party, and that may defer for a season the metaphysical abolition of slavery.

Mr. Smith makes one statement at the end of his tract which is at least novel, if not startling. He says, "The Constitution is a power in the hands of the people, which they cannot fling away without ingratitude to God, and treason to the slave; FOR GOD HAS GIVEN IT TO THEM!! He calls it "this shield which GOD has given us to put over the head of the slave;"—"this weapon which GOD has given us," &c. What proof has he that God has ever done any such thing? I always supposed that the Constitution was given to us by a Convention, consisting of twenty delegates, from what are now the Slave States, and nineteen from what are now the Free States. A considerable majority of them were slaveholders, and the private character of many, we know to have been very far from that which is usually supposed to mark the messengers of a divine revelation. The mass of them unquestionably intended to make the Constitution a pro-slavery instrument, and those whom Mr. Smith seems to regard as the best of them, (though I deny his fact, and dissent from his inference,) were, if his own hypothesis be correct, a profligate set of unprincipled scoundrels, "who were at least willing *to seem to intend it*," for their own purposes, intending at a proper time, to cheat their confederates. I cannot but think that Mr. Smith dishonors his Maker, by attributing to Him any share in such a business as this, other than he has in all wickedness, in giving to the perpetrators the breath of life.

I am sorry to say that the weakness of the reasoning of this tract is not its most observable feature. There is that in it which must disappoint those of us who have endeavored to make a distinction between Mr. Smith and the men with whom it is his pleasure to act; who had been willing to believe that he possessed a candor and truthfulness of character, which their actions had compelled us to deny to them. A main object of this pamphlet is to give currency to the slang-accusation of the hacks of the Third Party, that the Dissolution movement is a Non-Resistance movement,—and is intended as a covert attack on all Civil Government. Mr. Smith must know, (unless indeed he has refused to examine the facts, as he boasts of having done in another matter,) that this assertion is as ridiculous as it is false. It would not alter the state of the case, were the American Society, as Mr. Smith asserts, in the hands of the Non-Resistants; but he might have learned, had he inquired, that the mass of the Dissolution Party, including several of its leading spirits, are farther from being Non-Resistants, than he is himself, according to his own showing;—for they *have* made up their minds as to Non-Resistance, and rejected it. This sort of slang is of very small moment to those whom it is intended to injure, and they care nothing about it; but it is inconsistent with a truth-loving and ingenuous character.

Mr. Smith also says that "the Non-Resistants," alledging that some four or five leaders of the Liberty Party were bad men, urged the party to disband. No one has ever done this to my knowledge. It has been said, that as long as the Third Party retains its present leaders and influences, it could lay no higher claim to the confidence of Abolitionists, to say the very least, than either of the other two. And this on the same ground that that party condemns the other two,—the character of their candidates and leading influences. The question of the expediency of an Anti-Slavery political organization, is one entirely distinct from that of the character of the present party, derived like the character of all parties, from that of its leaders.

Mr. Smith also exhibits a sense of justice which is a little peculiar. He affirms that "the Non-Resistants," generally, but afterwards specifies Mr. Garrison, Mr. Collins, and myself, have brought certain charges against the old Committee of the American Society, "making our Stanton, and Leavitt, and Birney, and Tappans, guilty of a State's-prison grade of offences." These charges he makes it rather a virtue not to have investigated. Had he condescended to do so, he would have found that they consisted of a simple statement of facts, WHICH HAVE NEVER BEEN DENIED, derived chiefly from the records kept by those gentlemen themselves, (*not* from their ACCOUNTS, for we have ever been denied a glimpse at *them,*) of their doings when in the service of the Society. If inferences as to the character of those acts, of the description of which he complains, have been drawn from those statements, I apprehend the fault must be in the facts, and not in their narrators. Mr. Smith has never investigated these charges on account of what seemed to him their extravagance. And yet he seems to think it not extravagant at all for him virtually to charge Mr. Garrison, Mr. Collins, and myself, with being liars and slanderers, (which certainly *ought* to be of a State's-prison grade of offences, if they are not,) and to circulate the charge to the utmost extent of his influence. For liars and slanderers we of course are, if we have invented false statements of fact for the purpose of blackening the character of "men whose integrity," according to Mr. Smith, "is certainly as far above suspicion" as our own. And yet, I dare say Mr. Smith went to church the Sunday after he had uttered this charge against us, and thanked God that he was not as other men are, denunciatory and vituperative—even as those publicans.

Mr. Smith illustrates his position by saying, "Were I to see a newspaper article, entitled, "W. L. Garrison, a horse-thief," or "Edmund Quincy, a burglar," (I do not know whether or not his friends will thank him for this parallel, but it is his, not mine,) "I should either not read it at all, or read it to enjoy a joke. Mr. Smith's ideas of social duty differ widely from mine in this matter. I think it would be his duty to look into it. And if he should find that there was strong reason to believe the charges to be true,—especially, to make the illustration more complete, if he should happen to know that it was *his own* cattle or goods that we had made free with—and if he should see us prowling around his neighbors' houses and barns, I apprehend that he would be wanting in social duty if he did not put them on their guard, by stating the facts within his own knowledge. This is all that we have ever done.—Q.

PROGRESS OF REPUBLICANISM.

The State of New Jersey has recently adopted a new Constitution, in the first article of which are the following words:

"All men are by nature free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness."

The article defining the right of suffrage commences thus:

"Every WHITE male citizen of the United States, of the age of twenty-one years," &c. &c.

Fifty years hence, or less, some wise-acre will discover that the Constitution of New Jersey does not deny the right of suffrage to colored citizens, and that its framers could have had no such intention. Does it not say that "*all* men are by nature free and independent," and does it not define the rights of man so distinctly, that it could have intended only to ensure the right of suffrage to all? True it contains the words, "Every white male citizen" shall, &c. but this is not saying every *colored* citizen *shall not*, &c. Beside that term, "White male citizen," does not describe *any* class, for who is *perfectly white?* Such reasoning would be exactly on a par with the arguments used to show the anti-slavery character of the Constitution of the United States, and not one whit less ridiculous, or less unworthy the dignity of honest common sense.

LIBERTY PARTY IN VIRGINIA.

However contemptible a political movement at the North, for the abolition of slavery, may seem, when we know that its origin was in the bigotry of sectarianism, such a movement at the South, is deserving of respect. Taught to put their faith in politics, and nothing higher, looking only at their political relations, or rather looking not beneath these, and believing that if these merely outward indications shall have the semblance of right, that that for which they stand is right also, it is not strange that the people shall, to rectify a wrong, begin on the surface, believing that if that can be made to put on a fair seeming, the heart of the matter must cease to be corrupt. Removed as the people of Virginia are, from any direct intercourse with Abolitionists, and moved only by the outer circles of the undulations of that influence which comes from them, the form which their Anti-Slavery puts on must be of the lowest kind, and of the faintest effort. But it is a cheering sign of the times, nevertheless, to see that the cause has "crossed the border."

A Liberty party has been organized in Ohio County, in Western Virginia, and has issued an address to the citizens of that district. The address is entirely political in its character, and maintains the ostensible principles of the people of '76. It has little to say, except incidentally, of slavery itself, and views it rather in the gradual encroachments which, through the political power given to slaveholders, it has made upon the political rights of the whites, rather than as a system of outrage upon all the rights, civil and personal, of the blacks. This is as high ground, perhaps, as could be expected would be taken, and is an earnest of better things to come. Below is an extract from the address, and the resolutions passed at the Convention:

* * * * * * *

Does anybody in Virginia believe that slaveholding is right in itself? that it will bear the test of the golden rule, "whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them?" There may be here and there an individual slaveholder, who will maintain that he is warranted in holding slaves by the precepts of the Christian religion. But such persons are few. Most admit the wrong, and deplore the evil. But, they say, what can they do? We answer to the individual slaveholder, cease from doing what you feel to be wrong. Give fair wages to your laborer, and let their service be not compulsory but voluntary. We answer to the people collectively, repeal the laws which sanction slaveholding. Purify the statute-book from all enactments which authorize one man to take another man's work without wages. Look the monster evil, Slavery, directly in the face, and go about getting rid of it, as you would in the case of any other statute made evil. Surely the men of Western Virginia, especially, ought to consider this matter. In all the Western District, there were, according to the census of 1840, only 53,727 slaves, while the free population was 371,570. In the Eastern District, the free white population was 369, while the slaves numbered 395,250. The Western District has, in the House of Delegates 56 Representatives—the Eastern 78. In the Senate, the Western has 13 Representatives—the Eastern 19. The odious principle of representation for slaves, which has been allowed to prevail in the National Government, prevails also in the States, and with the same consequences. The fixed interests of the majority concerned in free labor, are sacrificed to the claims and caprices of the minority interested in slave labor. The political power of the State is East of the Blue Ridge. Ought this so to be? We appeal to the candid and dispassionate among the slaveholders themselves, and repeat, ought this so to be? We appeal to the non-slaveholding farmers, mechanics and laborers, and other industrious citizens of the State, and ask them if a system which subjects the majority to the minority, which crushes labor, and makes it dishonorable, which must forever prevent the establishment of an efficient system of general education, ought to be upheld by them? The whole number of the slaveholders in the State, does not exceed by a liberal computation, 50,000; that these may divide among themselves the ownership of 450,000 colored laborers, and carry on a trade in their industry and their persons, the rights and interests of the non-slaveholders are comparatively disregarded, and that too, without conferring any real benefit on the slaveholders themselves.

* * * * * * *

Pursuant to adjournment, a Convention was held in the barn of J. Gilmore, Esq.

The meeting was organized by calling Hugh Brownlee, to the Chair, and Thomas Todd, Secretary.

After several addresses, the following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Whereas, God, the Supreme Lord and King of all the world, hath ordained civil magistrates to be under Him, over the people, for his own glory, and the public good; and hath said, "He that ruleth with men must be just, ruling in the fear of God—men of Truth, hating covetousness." And whereas, slaveholding is clearly condemned in the Bible, "wo unto him that buildeth his house by unrighteousness, and his chambers by wrong; that useth his neighbor's service without wages, and giveth him not for his work." And whereas the two great political parties have selected candidates for the highest office in the gift of the people, men who advocate Slavery, and are practical slaveholders, and also guilty of other gross immoralities, showing their subserviency to slavery, and disregard of morality, therefore,

Resolved, That in organizing a Liberty Party in the State of Virginia, we do it from a sense of duty to God; and are determined to support no man or party in the management of political affairs, farther than measures and men in office are governed by the Bible, which we take as our supreme law, to which all other laws must conform.

Resolved, That we can no longer give our votes to elevate slaveholders to office, nor assist either of the political parties, so long as they sustain Slavery.

Resolved, That in our opinion, the removal of its influence in our General Government, would remove the great difficulty which besets its legislation, and consequently render more stable the policy of said Government.

Resolved, That our experience fully confirms us in the assertion that the use of the ballot for the slave's redemption, in a distinct organization, is demanded of us as true republicans, as Christians, patriots, and philanthropists.

Resolved, That the principles we profess, are the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and if carried on according to the intentions of the fathers of our country, our whole land will soon be free from one of the foulest stains that ever disgraced any nation.

Resolved, That if slavery had been abolished according to the anticipation of the Father of our Country, our beloved State would yet be in the enjoyment of that eminent position she occupied in his day. "But alas, how are the mighty fallen." She now stands forth in the list of States, and well may the finger of scorn and contempt be pointed at us as sons of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, for our recreancy in the cause of human rights.

Resolved, That we call upon all our fellow-citizens to examine our principles and come forward and aid us in raising the Standard of Liberty and morality, which we believe to be the true principles of democracy, and the only means of bringing back and saving our country from the withering grasp of slaveholders.

Resolved, That J. Gilmore, J. Emery, and S. M. Bell, be a committee to prepare an address, together with a ticket, and have them published with the proceedings of this meeting, in pamphlet form.

Resolved, That we respectfully solicit all editors friendly to our cause, to publish the proceedings of this Convention.

On motion, Resolved, That we adjourn.

HUGH BROWNLEE, *President.*

T. Todd, Secretary.

MR. CLEVELAND'S LETTER.

I meant to have replied briefly to this communication in to-day's paper, but being anxious to correct the misstatement, if I have made any, and to do simple justice to myself, if it shall appear that I have not, I prefer waiting another week that I may have something more to rely upon than my own memory merely. I may, however, say this now—that I did not pretend in the space of fifteen lines to give the details of a transaction, all of which it took a good half-hour at least of various and rapid talking to bring distinctly before the meeting. I meant only to give the *main fact*—the *spirit* of the thing done—and this, I still think, I have done faithfully. But it shall be shown next week, or candidly acknowledged that it cannot be. The important question at issue,—and which it seems to me Mr. Cleveland keeps out of sight—is, did he, or did he not, pursue such a course of conduct as showed plainly an unwillingness to permit the presence of a woman, because she was a *woman*, at a meeting where certain letters were to be read as a part of the business of that meeting?

A MEXICAN SLAVE CATCHER.

The Mexican schooner Rosetta, on her arrival at New Orleans, from Vera Cruz, on the 20th ultimo, had on board a mulatto woman and her son, whom the captain put into the hands of the police, stating that these persons—slaves—had got on board his vessel when last in port, without his knowledge or consent, and that he had not allowed them to land at Vera Cruz, but brought them back to New Orleans, to return them to their owners. He had also discovered that a white man named Francis Mitchell, a passenger, had been instrumental in conveying them on board the vessel. Mitchell fortunately did not return to New Orleans. Is there no law in Vera Cruz which will protect strangers who arrive there from abroad in their personal liberty, and is there no Mexican law which will punish the captain of the Rosetta as a kidnapper? This sort of piracy is considered rather honorable, than otherwise, all over the United States, but the humanity and Christianity of Mexico has a right to blush at such a deed.

PREFERMENT IN TEXAS.

The following paragraph appeared a few days since in the New-York Tribune. It has since been asserted, by Gen. Daff Greene, that the Gen. Burleson, who is the candidate for the Presidency in Texas, is not the man who committed those acts of petty scoundrelism when a resident of New-York. I have, however, been informed from undoubted authority, that the Tribune was right in the first instance, and that the man who is probably, ere this, President of Texas, is really a fugitive from justice from this State. When we take Texas, why not take the Texan President also, and give him a seat in the White House at Washington, rather than in the one at Sing Sing? The Tribune is over-nice. "Judge ye, which is of the most value, a man or a sheep"—which is the greatest crime, to cheat poor emigrants with counterfeit money, or sixty men and women, all their lives long, of all the wages of their labor.

Texas Illustrated.—The candidates for President of Texas are known to be Anson Jones, opposed to Annexation, and Gen. Burleson, in favor of it. The latter will probably succeed. The Troy Post gives some interesting reminiscences of his history. It seems that he was formerly a captain of a canal boat on our Northern Canal, where he was known as a man of good talents, but of loose principles. He associated himself with a gang of counterfeiters, and engaged in the business of passing off counterfeit money on the simple emigrants, &c. who travelled on his boat. In this game he was detected, arrested in Troy, and indicted. His lawyer told him that his only chance was to get the bail required and cut dirt. He did so; a man named Phelps went bail for him, and afterwards compromised for a small sum. Burleson slid for Texas, where he has long been a great man, and will probably be chosen President to-day.

If, by any possibility, his brother Annexationist, Polk, should triumph in this country, and Annexation be effected, we trust there will be a Whig Governor in this State who will send a process for this President of Texas, offhand. As Texas will have no use for him after Annexation, let us see what use we can put him to at Sing Sing.

JONATHAN WALKER.

This man, who is now in jail in Pensacola, for aiding fugitive slaves to escape, is from Harwick, Massachusetts, on Cape Cod. His imprisonment is exciting a great deal of feeling among his neighbors, by whomhe is respected and beloved. His case is a more cruel one even than Torrey's, for he is removed almost beyond the possibility of assistance in his trial, or otherwise, from his friends at the North. The following letter to his wife and children is published in the Boston Chronicle. God help him!

PENSACOLA, July 29, 1844.

Dear wife and children,—I have the privilege, by the mercy of our God and Father, of writing to you again, but my situation is far from being what I would choose. About the time I wrote my last letter, which was, I think, the 18th of June, I had made some arrangements to take some passengers to Nassau, New Providence, a little to the eastward of Cape Florida. On the 23d I started with seven colored persons in my boat. I was quite unwell two days before we left here, and the sixth day out I did not expect to survive twenty-four hours, but the next day I was a little better; and two or three days afterwards I had another severe ill turn, which I did but just survive. My sickness was intermittent fever and inward canker, brought on by extreme exposure. I never saw such hot weather in my life. We proceeded on our voyage down the coast, until the 8th of July, when the sloop Eliza Catherine, of Key West, (a wrecker,) fell in with us near Cape Florida, and took us by force to Key West. There I was taken before a Justice of the Peace, as they are called, and from thence to jail, where I remained four days, and then was put down a steamboat's hold, among filth, where it was extremely warm, and put in irons, hands and feet, where I remained nearly the whole time for six days, during which time she came to Pensacola, and here I was taken to the court-house, and from thence to jail, where I remain secured to a large ring-bolt by a chain made of half inch iron, and a shackle round my ankle, which weighs about five pounds, so that I have to lie or sit down all the time. If I could walk the room it would afford me great relief. I have for four or five days recovered my health quite fast, but from the 25th of June until the 23d of July, I was not able to sit up three hours in a day, and nearly all the time very much exposed. I cannot say when I shall have my trial, nor what the result will be. The regular term of Court does not come on until November, but the Judge does not know but that he shall appoint a special term before that time.

In about one day more, if we had not fallen in with an enemy, we should have been out of their way altogether.

Jane! what is to become of thee and the children? I have lost nearly what little I had in the fracas, and I am confident that you are needy at this time. You had better send and get the proceeds of that iron and spars which I sent to Fall River, and do as well as you can. Write me as soon as you get this, that I may know how it is.

The Lord Jesus has been abundantly good to me through all my afflictions thus far, and I feel and trust that his Spirit will accompany me through—for I cannot let him go. Should I be taken away to-day, I feel that all will be well beyond the grave. My confidence is strong in him, for he has purchased redemption by his blood for such vile sinners as me.

Dear wife and children, trust to Jesus for help. If you do in earnest, he will prove your best friend here and hereafter. Get your information from the New Testament, and do not trust in flesh.

O! my dear old parents, don't worry about me, for I am in good spirits, and shall weather the storm.

(Signed) JONA. WALKER.

OHIO AMERICAN SOCIETY.

It will be seen by the annexed letter, which I copy from the New Garden paper, that the Resolutions passed by this Society at its annual meeting, and which were published in the Standard at the time, were passed under some misapprehension, and that a correct Report was not given.

Jesse Holmes—Dear Friend.—The proceedings of the Anniversary Meeting of the Ohio American Anti-Slavery Society, need comment. The following resolution, offered by Cyrus McNeely, as a substitute for the Preamble and Resolution offered by Edward Brooke, was not rejected. The last one was, because those attending the meeting did not wish to censure any person, or any body of men, although they might feel called upon to protest against their measures.

The first resolution was withdrawn by the mover, solely because the meeting was not entirely unanimous in favor of its adoption. The Preamble and Resolution offered by E. Brooke, would, in my opinion, have been carried by a large majority, had the question been taken without an understanding that a resolution would be offered, and a motion made to lay it on the table, to be taken up next year for discussion, declaring our connection with the American Society, dissolved by its own action. An extreme opposition to a dissolution of our auxiliaryship to the American Society, was *manifested on the part of a few.* As a measure to satisfy them, I advocated the adoption of a resolution as a substitute for Edward Brooke's, with a promise, if a substitute was adopted, to offer the following resolution, and then make a motion for it to lay on the table, to be taken up at the next anniversary.

Resolved, That the American Society has, by its own action, disssolved our connection with it.

The substitute was adopted, under these circumstances, by a large majority. I then offered the resolution spoken of above; a motion was made for its adoption, and succeeded. I then moved to lay it on the table for future discussion, which motion was carried.

Respectfully, SAMUEL BROOKE.

"MIND YOUR Q's."

The Christian Freeman will have learnt by last week's Standard, that that "Q" in the paper of the week before, was an error. Its spiteful and ridiculous abuse, therefore, was as misapplied, as in any case it would be contemptible. The Freeman had better not turn aside from its warfare with petty politicians, for there it meets with opponents who understand and practise its mode of combat. Its thunder is all wasted when rolled this way.

GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

Foreign.

Late from St. Domingo.—The schooner Victorine, Capt. Bunce, arrived yesterday morning, in eighteen days from Jacquernel, (St. Domingo,) with the following intelligence. A report has reached Jacquernel, from Aux Cayes, that the blacks at that place had again broken out, and commenced hostilities against the yellow, or half-breed negroes, on account of the arrival of a great number of them from Jamaica, and other West India ports. Almost every vessel which had arrived from other parts of the West Indies, was full of the half-breeds, returned to the Island.

It was perfectly healthy at Jaemel, and as far as could be ascertained, all through the island. It was also very quiet there. Business was dull. American Produce scarce, and sold quick. Coffee and Logwood were plenty. A merchant from the city of St. Domingo reported that it was all quiet there, and in that neighborhood. There is no news as to the whereabouts of the President.—*Tribune of the 10th.*

Later from Mexico.—The New Orleans papers of the 29th ult. are in receipt of advices from Vera Cruz to the 13th. We select a few items, although the news is of little direct consequence. The Picayune says:

Our papers contain more of the correspondence between the foreign Ministers resident at Mexico and the Government of the country. We before remarked upon the supercilious tone assumed by Santa Anna's Secretary toward the Spanish Minister. He had in fact declared the correspondence at an end, inasmuch as he would allow of no foreign interference with the internal affairs of the Republic, and insisted upon the justice and policy of the infamous decree of the 17th of June, 1843, and expressed his determination to enforce it at all hazards. To this the Spanish Minister replied, that inasmuch as the door to a discussion of the subject had been closed by the Government, and as any further discussion might prove useless, he should lay the whole correspondence before the Government of Spain, whose duty it would become to say whether the affair should be thus terminated. At the same time, he protested against the right of the Mexican Government to impose silence upon whomsoever may be honored "to speak in the name of a nation which admits of no superior." This show of spirit drew at once from Santa Anna, through Senor Monasterio, (having charge of the portfolio of the Minister of Foreign Affairs during Bocanegra's absence,) a letter of apology. He disavowed any design of imposing silence upon the Spaniard, &c.

As for the French Minister, Santa Anna gets rid of him by announcing to Barron de Cyprey that the Mexican Government has given instructions to its own Representative in Paris to lay the whole matter in dispute directly before the Government of Louis Philippe, thereby rendering any farther discussion in Mexico useless.

On the 22d of July the British Minister made a demand of this nature upon the Government. He states that he has received intelligence that an Irishman, named William Hyland, who was on board the William A. Turner in the capacity of carpenter, suffered death with others taken with Sentmanat, and that he was executed without having been found in arms. He goes on to say, that while he abstains for the moment from expressing any opinion upon the melancholy information, he cannot allow himself to doubt that Bocanegra, in the name of the Mexican Government, will furnish him with the necessary proofs attesting that this unfortunate compatriot was not put to death without having first of all proceeded to grant him a trial, which, as a British subject, he had a right to expect. An explanation, he says, is necessary, for the satisfaction of the Government and people of Great Britain, and that it would have been demanded earlier had the name of the deceased been known to him. To this it is replied, that in the list of men executed as companions and accomplices of Sentmanat, transmitted by Gen. Ampudia, there is no such name as that pointed out; but that, whatever the case may be, the British Minister may be assured and completely convinced that every individual executed at Tobasco, justly merited his fate, since Gen. Ampudia proceeded with prudence, equity, and such forms of law as the gravity of the case demanded, in confirmation of which the release of the Englishman, Patterson, is cited.

The Bee has dates from the city of Mexico to the 3d. At that date, although the subsidy of $4,000,000 had been granted, as before stated, for the Texas campaign, no plan for levying or raising the sum had been devised. The subject was still under discussion in the Chamber of Representatives on the 3d instant. Trade in every department of the Republic was represented to be exceedingly depressed. The amount of internal customs or excises collected at the custom-house in Mexico for the month of July was $96,000. At Vera Cruz on the 16th, the *vomito* had in some degree subsided. Two French and two Spanish vessels of war were the only public vessels lying at Sacrificios.—*Tribune.*

General Items.

Episcopal Convention at Philadelphia.—Resignation of Bishop Onderdonk accepted.—Rev. Mr. Newton offered a resolution similar to that offered by Dr. Tyng, in the morning, for the exclusion of the public from the Convention. After considerable discussion it was withdrawn.

The Secretary presented two communications from Bishop Onderdonk, one of which was read, and gave an account of several of his Episcopal acts.

Rev. Mr. Odenheimer, the Assistant Secretary, being about to read the other communication, objection was taken by Dr. Tyng, and a motion to postpone the reading was offered and withdrawn. The document (letter) was read, which gave an account of the ill state of his health at that time, and which he declares has been gradually declining for the last sixteen years. *He states that he took brandy and water as a stimulant*, finding it to be almost the only thing which afforded him any relief when suffering the most intense and acute pains. He avers that the fact of his taking this fermented liquor is the foundation for the persecution and injustice that have been done him, &c. The other allegations brought against him (relating to improper familiarities with females, &c.) he solemnly denied, and courted an investigation.

The Convention proceeded to the consideration of the Bishop's resignation. Mr. Lewis R. Ashurst offered a resolution that it be accepted. Horace Binney, Esq. moved a postponement of the question, and spoke at great length. The debate was continued by Rev. Dr. Ducachet, D. Boyd, Rev. Mr. Huntingdon, Rev. Dr. Tyng, Rev. Mr. Maxwell, and the Secretary of the Convention—after which the greatest excitement was manifested in every part of the Convention, and cries of "Question," "Question," "Order," "Order," were heard, and the President was unable for several minutes to restore order.

Joseph R. Ingersoll, Esq. and John K. Zeilin, Esq. addressed the body on the subject before it.

The question was on Mr. Binney's motion to postpone the resolutions of Mr. Ashurst, and the vote being taken resulted as follows: Clergy, yeas 11—nays 52; Lay Delegates, yeas 15—nays 52.

Considerable debate then followed, when the final question upon the resignation of Right Rev. Bishop Onderdonk, was taken thus:—Clergy, yeas 51—nays 15; Churches, yeas 55—nays 15; and six were divided.

The resignation was therefore accepted, and Bishop Onderkonk is no longer the chief prelate of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Pennsylvania.

The Convention then adjourned *sine die*, without electing an Assistant Bishop, or even making an attempt.—*Tribune.*

The Mexican Steamers.—We are sorry to learn, by a note from the Mexican Consul here, John Granga, Esq. that a portion of our population have been in the habit of treating with insult and indignity the crews of the Mexican Steamers now in our port on a friendly errand, and one profitable to a large class of our mechanics, and of exciting popular feeling and prejudice against them. This is indeed a pitiable business for an American to be engaged in, and we are sorry that any one can have so far forgotten himself. No matter how anxious for "Immediate Annexation" many may be, yet decency should teach all to treat with becoming respect well-behaved foreigners who come among us. We give a portion of the Consul's note:—

"The attention of the subscriber has been directed to a communication in the Journal of Commerce, purporting to give an account of a transaction between an officer on board the Mexican Steam Frigate Guadaloupe, and the Captain of a brig which was supplying the frigate with coal. The communication is of the same character with paragraphs which have appeared in the newspapers before, the tendency and object of which have been to bring into discredit the Mexican officers, and excite popular feeling against them. The transaction referred to is misrepresented throughout. The concluding part is as follows: 'He (the officer) ordered a dozen of his sailors on board with drawn cutlasses; but as soon as they made their landing upon the brig's deck, Captain Arey, with only a handspike, and alone, drove the whole posse back into the steamer. The officer, finding he had his match, ordered a file of marines to load with ball, and fire into the brig; and they were in the very act of firing, when the Captain of the steamer came out of his cabin to know the cause of so much noise, and thus prevented bloodshed, which, if it had taken place, there would have been but little of the Guadaloupe left, or her men.'

"The whole of this, so far as it purports to relate what actually did take place, and without noticing what might have been the consequence to the Guadaloupe, is absolutely and entirely untrue; no cutlasses were drawn, and no order given to fire; although the officer had the strongest provocation, in a torrent of insult and abuse poured upon himself and the Mexican nation.

"Ever since the arrival of the Mexican steam frigates in this port, they have been subject to a series of annoyances and vexations, which all good citizens, whether friends to Mexico or not, must condemn. The commander has been harrassed with arrests at the suit of deserters. A lieutenant has been arrested for an act done on board of his vessel, in the discharge of his official duty, and to preserve the discipline of his ship.

"These cases are now before a tribunal, which, while it maintains the laws of this country, will be careful in protecting the rights of a friendly nation. Indeed, the opinion of the Court, promptly and decidedly expressed, has already saved the commander from a multitude of suits; but the deserters who threatened them have been active wherever their influence extended in exciting a prejudice against the Mexicans; and aided by causes which it is unnecessary to mention, they have been so far successful, that in certain quarters of the city the officers are insulted as they pass through the streets; and workmen and others, going on board their vessels on business, treat them with contumely."

In regard to the affair of the coal-brig, we were told by the Custom-house officer on board at the time that the Mexican officer of the deck *did* order the marines to load and draw up in readiness to fire upon the brig before the Mexican Captain made his appearance. As our informant does not understand Spanish, he only drew his conclusion from the motions of the marines, which he assures us were no more equivocal than very deliberately loading their pieces.—*Tribune.*

OBITUARY NOTICE.

At a meeting of Colored citizens, convened at Zion's Church on the 25th of August, the following Preamble and Resolution was unanimously adopted, viz:—

Whereas, an All-wise Providence has been pleased to remove from among us our friend and beloved fellow-citizen, Daniel Jones, Jr. Esq. whose loss is a public calamity, and falls most heavily upon the colored people, in view of the place he so honorably filled at the School Committee Board, at the time of his death; and whereas, he has long been the faithful advocate of the rights and privileges of this despised class, ever to be found in the defence of their rights, therefore,

Resolved, That it is the unanimous sense of this meeting, that we make a public acknowledgment of the esteem in which we have held him, and that, so long as grateful feeling is a tribute to a disinterested benefactor, that feeling shall live in our hearts, as an evidence of our affection and love of his Christian character and philanthropy.

EDWARD J. POMPEY, Chairman,
SAMUEL C. HARRIS, Secretary.

[Nantucket Paper.

Married,

On Thursday evening, September 5th, by Rev. Theo. S. Wright, Mr. THOMAS HAMILTON, to Miss CATHARINE ANN LEGNARD, all of this city.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

For the Standard—from August 24th, to Sept. 7th, 1844.

Eastern (Penn.) Anti-Slavery Society,	$200.00	
A. W. Padelford, Elgin, Kane co. Ill.	2.00	
Catharine Lougee, Dover, N. H.	2.00	
Joseph Kay, " "	2.00	
L. L'Due, Sherman, Ct.	1.00	
Maria E. Whitcomb, Brooklyn, Ct.	2.00	
A. Weller, Skeneateles, N. Y.	1.00	
T. C. Holmes, Kingston, Mass.	1.00	
N. Snow, Cambridgeport, "	11.67	
C. S. Howard, Rochester, N. H.	2.00	
Sarah J. Hale, " "	2.00	
S. & A. E. Worster, " "	2.00	
Female A. S. Society, Newburyport, Mass.	2.50	
J. L. Hinckley, South Coventry, Ct.	.50	
E. Degarno, Rochester, N. Y.	2.00	
Lewis Burtis, " "	2.00	
John A. Chandler, Pomfret, Vt.	2.50	
David Chandler, "	.50	
James Judkins, Byesville, Ohio,	3.00	
Jane F. Godwin, Plymouth, Mass.	2.00	
John G. King, Salem, "	.50	
Benj. Merrill, " "	1.50	
Abby C. Walker, Great Falls, N. H.	2.00	
Josiah Watson, " "	1.00	
Silas Earle, Leicester, Mass.	1.00	
Sydney Downes, "	3.00	
Alexander D. Bray, Gloucester, Mass.	2.00	
J. F. McKee, Perry, N. Y.	4.00	
Received by E. D. Hudson,—		
Alonzo Henry, Palmer Depot, Mass.	1.00	
Melissa Kendell, " "	2.00	
Mariah Henry " "	1.00	
	——	262.67
Donations.		
Maria W. Chapman,	25.00	
	——	25.00
Total amount received - -		$287.67

FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer.

NOTICES.

PHILADELPHIA FEMALE A. S. SOCIETY.

A stated meeting of the Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society, will be held on Thursday afternoon, September 12th, at Sarah Douglass' schoolroom, Seventh st. below Arch. PHEBE EARLE, *Sec.*

WINDHAM COTNTY.—(POSTPONED.)

The Windham County Anti-Slavery Society will hold a meeting in Chaplin, on Thursday, the 20th (not 13th) instant, commencing at 10 o'clock, a. m.

It is to be hoped the abolitionists in this vicinity will rally in mass to this meeting. Speakers of ability and eminence are expected to be present.

JAMES B. WHITCOMB. Sec'y.

TO THE ABOLITIONISTS OF EASTERN PENN SYLVANIA.

Dear friends and fellow laborers.—With hopeful hearts, we have commenced our preparations for our next annual fair, resolved that it shall be greatly superior to that of the last year. For the accomplishment of this purpose, we are dependent upon you. Will you not give us ample proof that we have not relied upon you in vain? You cannot need that we should offer you incentives to increased diligence and zeal in our common cause. The image of the suffering slave is vividly before your mental vision; and were you in any danger of forgetting the sad living picture, it would be frequently revived by some new odious manifestation of the slave power, or by the presence of the fugitive, crossing, in the haste of terror, your brighter path.

Nor need we present to you arguments in favor of this method of advancing our cause. You are aware that our fairs have been a source of great pecuniary profit, as the reports of the treasurer of the Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society show. The principal part of the profit derived from them have passed into the treasury of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society, of which you are members. In asking your assistance, then, we are but asking you to aid our common cause, through the agencies which you have constituted. You have nobly responded to our calls, in other years. Have you not commenced our second decade with renewed ardor and increased self-sacrifice? Will you not evince it by immediately beginning, with us, preparations for the fair of 1844? Labor, each according to your ability or inclination, to let each do something. All marketable comm

Poetry.

For the National Anti-Slavery Standard.

TO THE NORTH STAR.

BY T. B. S.

Bright Star of the North! Steadfast in thy place
Thou standest, a sure beacon to the land
Of Liberty, for the sable wanderer.
While fleeing his native home, where galling
Chains, and cruel, bleeding stripes, and heavy
Lashes, are his allotted portion. We hail
Thee with a generous salutation,
For the blessed office thou dost freely
Thus perform for man! May thy bright, pure face,
In radiance beam, as a fixed light-house,
Pointing the oppressed to Freedom's bourne.
Oh, blessed one! let ransomed bondmen greet
Thee with beaming eyes, and smiles of welcome,
That will vie with thine own fair face of love.
Blaze on, bright one, in peerless light! and let
No cruel cloud, for any lengthened time,
Obscure thee! lest the lone wanderer, whom
Methinks I see now fleeing from his land
Of birth, to find a more propitious home;
Pursued by him who bonsts of human rights
And liberal laws, should faint and lose his way.
Extend to him the hand of hope and kind
Assurance, and on his journey cheer him
Forward, for sure his path is dark, and lone,
And dismal! Yes, and if the hot bloodhounds
Of his hunters, hellish and fiendlike, chance
O'ertake him on the way, oh! hard and sore
Will be his lot; to prison dark and drear
He then will captive go, and galling chains,
And cutting stripes, his unprotected limbs
Will feel! Or if perchance in mad despair
He should forego the boon of life, we could
Scarcely blame him; his case was desperate.
And let thy sparkling throng around thee,
In their circuit fly, and aid thy balance
Sure to keep so long as fair Columbia's
Laws will cherish such a wicked system.
And when oppression's bonds are known no more,
We'll honor thee for favors past conferred.
At times, the task to stars allotted is
An honorable one. When God's creative
Power went forth anew this world to form,
The morning stars together sang, and all
The sons of God in joy did shout. Thy voice
That song did swell, and thy radiant face
I fancy brighter now, because thou sang
Most joyous then. And when the full period
For the blest Ransom of our fallen race
Had come—that consummation of the scheme
Of Heaven's richest grace to sinning man,
An Eastern Star was sent, a beacon-light,
To guide the wise men on to the place
Where the infant Saviour lay; and as it
Led them on, no doubt an honest pride it
Felt, for such a favored occupation.
When over the place where the "Young Child" was,
It stood, serene, and bright, and beautiful.
Didst thou envy it then its matchless task?
Well you might! Nevermore will any star
On such an errand go. But thou, fair one
Of the Polar North, hast ground to utter
No complaint. Thy mission, too, is Mercy's
Honored call, and most faithfully the task
Has been performed: may it thus continue
While Slavery finds a cherished home on earth.

Philadelphia, August, 1844.

BERKSHIRE.

The following lines, by Oliver Wendell Holmes, were read at the Berkshire Jubilee. They are admirable for their humorous pathos, and playful wit.

Come back to your mother, ye children, for shame,
Who have wandered like truants, for riches or fame!
With a smile on her face and a sprig in her cap,
She calls you to feast from her bountiful lap.

Come out from your alleys, your courts, and your lanes,
And breathe, like young eagles, the air of our plains;
Take a whiff from our fields, and your excellent wives
Will declare it's all nonsense insuring your lives.

Come you, of the Law, who can talk if you please,
Till the man in the moon will allow it's a cheese,
And leave "the old lady, that never tells lies,"
To sleep with her handkerchief over her eyes.

Ye Healers of men, for a moment decline
Your feats in the rhubarb and ipecac line;
While you shut up your turnpike, your neighbors can go
The old roundabout road to the regions below.

You Clerk, on whose ears are a couple of pens,
And whose head is an anthill of units and tens;
Though Plato denies you, we welcome you still
As a featherless biped, in spite of your quill.

Poor drudge of the city! how happy he feels,
With the burs on his legs, and the grass at his heels;
No *dodger* behind, his bandannas to share,
No constable grumbling, "You mustn't walk there."

In yonder green meadow, to Memory dear,
He slaps a musquetoe, and brushes a tear;
The dew-drops hang round him, on blossoms and shoots,
He breathes but one sigh for his youth and his boots.

There stands the old School-house, hard by the old Church;
That tree at its side had the flavor of birch,
Oh sweet were the days of his juvenile tricks,
Though the prairie of youth had so many "big licks."

By the side of yon river he weeps and he slumps,
The boots filled with water as if they were pumps;
Till sated with rapture, he steals to his bed,
With a glow in his heart, and a cold in his head.

'Tis past—he is dreaming—I see him again;
His ledger returns as by Lecerdemain;
His neck-cloth is damp, with an Easterly flaw,
And he holds in his fingers an omnibus straw.

He dreams the shrill gust is a blossomy gale,
That the straw is a rose from his dear native vale;
And murmurs, unconscious of space and of time,
A. I. Extra-super—Ah, isn't it PRIME!"

Oh what are the prizes we perish to win,
To the first little "shiner" we caught with a pin!
No soil upon earth is so dear to our eyes
As the soil we first stirred in terrestrial pies!

Then come from all parties, and parts, to our feast,
Though not at the "Astor," we'll give you at least
A bite at an apple, a seat on the grass,
And the best of old—water—at nothing a glass.

SONNET.

BY LEIGH HUNT.

Abon Ben Adhem (may his tribe increase)
Awoke one night from a deep dream of peace,
And saw, within the moonlight in his room,—
Making it rich and like a lily in bloom,—
An Angel writing in a book of gold.
Exceeding peace had made Ben Adhem bold,
And to the presence in the room he said,
"What writest thou?" The vision raised its head,
And, in a voice made all of sweet accord,
Answered, "The names of those who love the Lord!"
"And is mine one?" said Adhem. "Nay, not so,"
Replied the Angel. Adhem spoke more low,
But cheerly still, and said: "I pray thee, then,
Write me as one who loves his fellow-men."
The Angel wrote and vanished. The next night
He came again, with a great wakening light,
And showed the names whom love of God had blest;
And lo! Ben Adhem's name led all the rest.

Miscellany.

From Tait's Magazine.

THE CURATE; OR, HOPES.

TRANSLATED FROM FREDERIKA BREMER'S SHORT STORIES.

I always had a peculiar method of travelling with the least possible distress along the stony road of life; although, in a physical as well as in a moral sense, I generally walked barefoot. I hoped! hoped on from day to day, from morn to even, at evening for the next morning; in autumn for spring, in spring for autumn; from one year to another: and thus I had hoped away almost thirty years of my life's journey, without feeling severely any of my troubles, except the want of good boots. I consoled myself under this calamity when in the open air; but when introduced into respectable company, I was tormented with a desire of setting my heels foremost, because they were best covered with leather. I ought to confess, too, that I felt my poverty still more when, in the huts of misery, I could give no better comfort than friendly words. But I comforted myself, like thousands beside, with a hopeful glance at fortune's rolling wheel, and the philosophical observation, "Time will bring good counsel."

When I was curate under a country clergyman, with scanty pay and mean fare, morally languishing, with no society but the ill-tempered wife of the tippling parson, the booby son, and the daughter, who, with high shoulders and feet turned in, went prying about from morning till night, I felt a sudden rapture of tenderness and delight when a letter, from one of my old acquaintances, gave me the information that my uncle P——, a merchant in Stockholm, personally unknown to me, lay at the point of death, and, under a sudden attack of family affliction, had expressed a desire to behold his good-for-nothing nephew.

And now see the thankful nephew, with a little lean bundle under his arm, and a million of rich hopes in his breast, seated upon a most uncomfortable stiff-necked market cart, jogging along, up hill and down hill, to the capital!

At the tavern where I alighted, I ventured to order a little, only a very little, breakfast—just a slice of bread and butter and two eggs. My landlord and a fat gentleman walked to and fro in the room, and chatted. "I must say," said the fat gentleman, "this wholesale tradesman P——, who died yesterday was a rascal."

"Ha, ha," thought I, "but a rascal who had plenty of gold. Harkye, friend, (to the waiter,) can you bring me a slice of roast beef, or whatever meat you have, to make me more substantial fare here. A dish of soup would not be amiss: but quick, if you please!"

"Yes," said my landlord, "it is heavy—thirty thousand dollars, and bank stock beside! No one in town would have dreamed it—thirty thousand!" "Thirty thousand!" I inwardly ejaculated in my joyous soul. "Harkye, waiter! give me as soon as you can, thirty thousand—no, no—give mea pint of wine, I mean;" and all my pulses were beating merrily to the tune of "thirty thousand."

"Ah!" said the fat gentleman, "and would you believe that among his debts is one of five thousand dollars for champaigne? There stand his creditors clenching their fists; for all his furniture is worth but a few pence, and outside his door they find for their comfort—his calash!"

"Aha, that's another thing!" said I to myself. "Here waiter! take away the beef, the soup, and the wine. I must not taste them: for what have I been doing all the morning but eating!" "You have ordered them," said the waiter. "Friend!" said I, scratching out an apology just behind my ear, "it was an error; I ordered them for a rich gentleman, as I supposed, who is now as poor as myself, I find, and will never be able to pay for them; but you shall have the money for the eggs and bread and butter I have eaten, as well as something to drink for your trouble." So saying, and slipping a trifle more than the charge into his hand, I left the tavern with a wounded heart and unappeased stomach, to seek for cheap lodgings, and to study means of raising money.

This violent collision between my hopes and the reality had given me the headache; but when I met, during my street wandering, a gentleman decked with bands and stars, but with a faded face and wrinkled brow, and saw a young nobleman whom I had known at the University of Upsal, walking as if the weight of age and "tædium vitæ" would bring him down upon his nose, I lifed up my head, took a deep inspiration of the air, (which, unfortunately for me, was just there strongly scented with sausages cooking,) and felt the happiness of poverty with a pure heart!

In a remote street I found a little chamber to let, which suited better my present condition than my hopes two hours before.

I had gained leave to spend the winter in Stockholm. "And now," thought I, "what is to be done?" To let my spirits sink was the worst way possible; to put my hand in my bosom, and look up to heaven was not much better. "The sun breaks out when we least expect him," said I, while the heavy autumnal clouds were sinking down over the town.—I resolved to do my utmost to gain some more comfortable prospect for the future than my stay with the country pastor afforded me, and at last I fixed upon seeking employment as a copyist.

Then I spent many days in fruitless endeavors to find ears that were not deaf to my applications, and then in the breast-burdening toil of copying out the empty productions of empty heads. My dinners became more and more economical; but my hopes continued to rise until an evening, from which, in my calendar, I date a new era with a cross. My landlord had just left me to my meditations, with the comfortable observation, as a text, that to-morrow I must pay down my quarter's rent, unless I *preferred* (quite French politeness!) making another tour of discovery about the streets.

It was an indescribably cold November's evening, and I had just returned from visiting a house of sickness, where I had, perhaps imprudently, emptied my purse, when I was greeted with this amiable salutation.

I trimmed my sleepy, dim-burning lamp, with my fingers, and then looked about my little dingy chamber for plans of money-making.

"Diogenes was *worse* accommodated," I sighed, as I pulled my lame table away from the window, for the wind and rain seemed unwilling to stay outside. At the same moment, my glance fell upon a cheerfully glowing fire in an opposite kitchen. "O cooks! you have a glorious lot among mortals!" thought I, while with some secret pleasure I watched the well-nourished dame, who stood like an empress amid the pots and stew-pans, surrounded with the glory of the fire, and swaying the tongs as a sceptre over her glowing dominions.

On a higher floor I had a view through the window, covered with no envious blind, of a gaily illumined chamber, where a numerous family were assembled around a tea-table. I was stiff in every limb with cold and damp, and how empty that part of my animal economy, which may be styled the magazine, was that evening, I will not say; but "Merciful Heaven!" thought I, "if that pretty maiden, who is just now reaching a cup of tea to the stout gentleman upon the sofa, who seems too heavily replenished to rise from his seat, would but put out her fair hand a little farther this way, and could——with a thousand thankful kisses—how foolish! The fat gentleman takes the cup, and dips his bun in the tea so deliberately—'tis enough to make one cry! And now that pretty maiden is carressing him! I wonder if he is her papa, or her uncle; or perhaps, enviable mortal!—but no, that cannot be; he is at least forty years older than she!

"*That* must be his wife, surely; that elderly lady who sits beside him on the sofa, and to whom the fair maiden just now offers a platter of cakes. But to whom does she offer them now? One ear and a part of a shoulder is all that projects beyond the rim of the window. How long he keeps the gentle girl waiting his pleasure! but it must be a lady—no gentleman would behave so!—or it may be her brother. Ah! see his great fist thrust into the biscuit basket, a rude lout! but, perhaps, he was hungry. Now she turns to the two little girls, her sisters, most likely, and gives them all that Mr. One-ear has left behind. As for herself, she seems to take no more of the tea than I do, except its fragrance. But what a movement suddenly takes place in the room! The old gentleman starts up from the sofa: the one-eared gentleman rushes forward, and gives the gentle maiden a rude shock (a dromedary as he is!) that impels her against the tea-table, and makes the old lady, who was just rising from the sofa, sit down again. The children skip about and clap their hands; the door opens; in comes a young officer; the maiden throws herself into his arms! Aha! there I have it! I dashed to my window-shutter, so that it cracked; and sat down, wet with the rain, and with trembling knees, upon my stool.

"What had I to do staring through the window? This comes of curiosity!"

Eight days before, this family had returned from the country into the fine house opposite, and all this time I had never inquired who they were. What business had I, this evening, to be prying into their circle? What good could it do to me?

I was in a sorry mood, and felt something of heart-heaviness; but, according to my resolution never to yield to despondency, I set about a description of domestic happiness, of that happiness which I had never tasted! Said I, as I breathed upon my stiffened fingers, "Am I, then, the first who has sought in the hot-house of imagination a pleasing warmth which the hard world of realities denies us? Six dollars for a load of pine wood; ay, you will not have them till December. I will write!"

"Happy, thrice happy is the family in whose close and warm circle no heart feels lonely in its joys nor in its sorrows; no glance, no smile remains unanswered; where the members daily say to each other, not in mere words, but in their actions, your cares, your joys, your fortunes, are also mine!"

"Beautiful is the quiet, peaceful house, which closes its protecting walls around the pilgrim through life, which collects around its friendly, gleaming hearth, the old grandsire, leaning upon his staff, the manly husband, the amiable wife, and their happy children, who close the day of sport and enjoyment with hearty thanksgiving, while the mother chants to them a little song, telling how,—

"Angels their vigils keep
Around the bed
And o'er the head
Of innocence asleep!'"

Here I had to stop; for something like a drop of rain fell upon my cheek, and I could not see my paper clearly.

"How many," thought I, as my thoughts, against my will, took a melancholy turn, "how many are doomed to know nothing of this happiness!" For a moment I considered myself in the only looking-glass I had in my chamber, that of *truth*, and then with gloomy feelings I wrote on,—"Unhappy surely, is the desolate one who, in the cold and dreary moments of life, (which come so often,) can rest on no faithful bosom, whose sighs are unanswered, to whose complaint no voice replies. 'I understand you; I sympathize with you!' He is depressed: no one raises his drooping head! He weeps: no one regards it! He goes away: no one follows him! He sleeps: no one watches over him! He is *alone!* Why does he not die? Ah! who would mourn over him? How cold the grave which no warm tear of love bedews! He is lonely in the winter's night. For him earth has no flowers, and dimly burn the lights of heaven. Why wanders he here alone? Why does he not flee as a shadow to the land of shadows? Ah! he still *hopes*. A pauper, he begs for happiness, and hopes, in the eleventh hour, that some friendly hand will bestow it." It was my own situation that I described.

Early robbed of my parents,—without brother, sister, friends and relatives, I stood so lonely and desolate in the world, that, but for a strong confidence in Heaven, and a naturally cheerful disposition, I should have sought an escape from such an existence. Hitherto, more from instinct than philosophy, I had habitually suppressed all earnest longings for a happier state of life than that which surrounded me; but lately, other thoughts had been gaining power over me, and especially this evening, I felt an unutterable desire for a friend, for one whom I might love; in short, for a bosom companion,—a wife,—one with whom I might feel myself a king, even in the meanest hut! But I remembered, as I involuntarily shuddered with cold, that all my love, in such circumstances as the present, could not prevent my wife, if I had one, from being frozen, or starved to death. More depressed than ever, I arose from my stool, and paced up and down in my little boundary. The oppressive feeling of my situation followed me like my shadow on the wall; and, for the first time in my life, I was *quite* disheartened, and cast a gloomy glance upon the future.

"But what in the world," I exclaimed earnestly to myself, "will all this dull pondering avail?" Again I tried to loosen myself from the anxious thoughts that plagued me. "If but one Christian soul would only come to see me, whoever it might be, friend or foe,—any visiter would be welcome to break this dismal solitude. Yea, if one from the world of spirits would open the door, he should be welcome. What was that? Three knocks at the door! I'll not believe my senses—Three knocks again!" I went and opened the door. Nobody was there; but the wind howled along the staircase. Hastily I closed the door, put my hands in my pockets, and continued my parade, humming, to keep up my courage. In a few moments I heard something like a sigh. I stopped and listened. Again I heard distinctly a sigh, and that so deep and sorrowful, that with considerable emotion I called out, "Who is there?" No answer was returned. I stood for a moment to study what all this could mean, when a frightful noise, as if a host of cats were coming screaming down stairs, ending with a heavy thump against my door, made me decided for action. I took up my glimmering light, but, in the moment that I opened the door, it expired, or was blown out. A gigantic white figure hovered before me, and I felt myself suddenly grasped by two powerful arms. I cried out for help, and struggled so hard, that my antagonist fell to the ground with me: but I happened to be uppermost. Like an arrow I bounded up, and would have run, but stumbled over something,—Heaven knows what,—I believe somebody had seized my feet: again I fell to the ground, struck my head against the corner of the table, and lost my senses, with a sound like loud laughter ringing in my ears.

When I opened my eyes again, they encountered a dazzling glare. I closed them again, and listened to a distracting noise that hovered around me. Again I opened them, and tried to distinguish and recognize some of the objects about me, which seemed to me so new and wonderful, that I suddenly feared I had lost my senses. I lay upon a sofa, and—no, I was not deluded!—the beautiful maiden who had hovered before my imagination all the evening, now *really* stood beside me, with a heavenly expression of sympathy, and bathed my head with vinegar! A young man, whose face seemed familiar to me, stood and held my hand. I saw also the fat old gentleman, and another thin gentleman, and next I discovered the lady, the children, and the paradise of the tea-table glimmering in a sort of twilight distance; in short, by some inconceivable humor of fortune, I found myself in the midst of the very family which I had, an hour before, contemplated with such interest!

As I recovered my faculties, the military young man enfolded me in his arms. "Do you not know me again?" said he, while I sat still as if petrified. "Have you forgotten Augustus, whose life you saved not long ago at the risk of your own? whom you fished out of the water, at the risk of remaining to keep company with fishes yourself? See, here are my father, my mother, and my sister Wilhelmina." I pressed his hand. Then, with a smart blow with his fist upon the table, the father exclaimed, "And because you have saved my son's life, and you are an honorable fellow, that can suffer hunger to afford food to others, I declare you shall have the benefice at H——. I— I have the patronage, you understand?" For a while I was bereft of the power of thought and speech; and, amid all the explanations that were given, there was only one thing that impressed itself clearly on my mind—that Wilhelmina was *not*—that Wilhelmina *was* the *sister* of Augustus!

He had, that evening, returned from a journey during which, in the preceding summer, I had enjoyed the happiness of saving his life. Previous to this accident, I had only drunk with him in the brotherhood of the University. He had related to his family, with all the enthusiasm of youth, my good service in his behalf, and all that he knew of me besides. His father, who had a benefice in his gift, and (as I afterwards learned) had glanced with pity, sometimes, through the window upon my scanty table, had resolved, at the request of his son, to raise me from the lap of poverty to the summit of happiness. Augustus, in his delight, would make this resolution instantly known to me; and, in his love of a practical joke, he approached my chamber in the style already described; the consequence of which, for me, was my wound upon the temple, and my translation across the street out of darkness into light! A thousand times has the good youth begged forgiveness for his indiscretion, and as many times have I assured him that the benefice of H—— would prove a balsam strong enough to cure a deeper wound! Astonished was I to find that the ear and shoulder of the gentleman who at tea-time was the subject of my splenetic observations, belonged to no one less than my patron. The stout gentleman was Wilhelmina's uncle.

The kindness and cheerfulness of my new friends made me soon feel at home and happy. The old people treated me as if I was their child, and the young people admitted me to all the privileges of a brother. After I had received two cups of tea from the hand of Wilhelmina, I arose to take my leave of the family for the night. All invited me to stay; but I determined to spend my first happy night in my old lodging, and there to offer thanks to the Guide of my destiny. Augustus attended me to my resting place. There my landlord stood in the chamber, between the overthrown stool and table, with an aspect something between rain and sunshine. One side of his mouth was screwed up to his ear with an attempt at a smile, while the other was drawn down to his chin with suspicion; his eyes followed the same directions, and his whole face seemed seized with a cramp, until Augustus requested him to leave us alone, and then his countenance dissolved into a smile of the grinning species.

Augustus was most earnestly indignant at the sight of my table, my stool, and my bed, and talked of whipping my landlord for his extortion. I was compelled to assure him that I would change my lodgings on the coming day. When my friend had left me, I spent some time in meditating upon this change in my fortunes, and thanked God heartily for it. Then my thoughts ran away to my pastoral charge, and Heaven only knows with how many fat oxen, with what flowers, and fruits, and trees. I replenished my paradise, where I wandered with my Eve, and how many richly edified souls I saw streaming out of my church. I baptized, I confirmed, I betrothed the dear children of my pasturage, and forgot none but the funeral ceremonies.

At last, beyond midnight, I closed my eyes, and gave up my thoughts to the wild powers of dreamery. Then I preached with a loud voice in my church; while my congregation would persist in sleeping. After divine service, my congregation came out of the church transformed into sheep and oxen, bleating and lowing at me when I reproved them. I tried to lead my wife away; but could not separate her from a great turnip-plant that grew, and grew, till it covered both our heads. Then I tried to climb up to heaven upon a ladder; but potatoes, grass, tares, and peas, entangled my feet, and hindered every step. At last I saw myself walking upon my head among my possessions; and as I wondered how this could be, I fell more soundly asleep. Yet I must have continued my pastoral dream: for in the morning I woke myself at the end of a long sermon, by saying "Amen!" I had some trouble to convince myself that the events of the preceding evening did not belong to my dreams, until Augustus made his appearance, and invited me to be with his family at noon.

The pastorate, Wilhelmina, the family into which I had entered; the new hopes of the future that now glittered in the sunshine of the present; all filled me with a joy to be felt, not described!

From the depth of a thankful heart, I hailed the new life dawning upon me with a resolution, whatever might come, *to do the best, and hope for the best in every case!*

Two years after that happy dinner, I sat, one autumn evening, in my snug parsonage, beside the fire. Close to me sat my dear wife, my Wilhelmina, and span. I was about to read to her the sermon I had prepared for the next Sunday, and which I *hoped* would prove very edifying to my congregation. As I turned over the manuscript, a loose leaf fell out. It was the very paper upon which, just two years previous to that evening, I had written down my thoughts on domestic happiness, in a situation, apparently, so far away from everything of the kind. I showed it to my wife. She read it, and smiled through her tears; then, with an arch expression which is, I believe, peculiar to herself, she took up my pen and wrote on the other side of the leaf as follows:—

"The author can now, I hope, give a picture of his situation quite a contrast to that on the reverse. Now, he is no longer lonely, no more forsaken and desolate. His gentlest sigh is answered; his most intimate sorrows are shared with his wife. He goes; her heart follows him. He comes; she hastens to meet him with a smile. His tears are wiped away by her hand, and his smiles are reflected upon her face. She plucks flowers to strew his path. He has a flock dear to him; several devoted friends; and he counts as his relatives all who are destitute. He loves; he is beloved. He has the power to make men happy; he *is* happy."

Truly has my Wilhelmina painted my present situation; and, inspired with feelings cheerful and bright as sunbeams in spring, I send forth my hopes to delight themselves in the future.

I *hope* that my sermon for next Sunday will be useful to my people; and though some of the careless ones may be fast asleep, I hope that will not be allowed to disturb my temper. For my coming children, I have hopes prepared. If I have a son, I *hope* he may prove my successor; if a daughter, oh, I have *hopes* for her!

I hope, in the course of a little time, to find a publisher for my sermons.

I hope to live many years with my wife.

We, that is Wilhelmina and myself, hope, during this time to dry many tears, and for ourselves, to shed as few as may fall to the lot of children of the earth such as we are.

We hope that neither of us will long survive the other.

Lastly, we hope, that we shall always be able to hope while here; and, when all the hopes of this green earth must vanish away before the light of eternal certainties, then we hope our Good Father will pronounce a mild judgment upon his humble and hopeful children.

From the Baltimore American.

IMPROVEMENTS IN THE ELECTRO-MAGNETIC TELEGRAPH.

Professor MORSE having successfully accomplished the great essential objects of his Telegraph, has lately been turning his attention to the simplification of some of the minor details with a no less successful issue. We have it in our power to mention some improvements which he has made, all resulting in economy. Mr. MORSE had originally calculated that it might require a battery of at least one hundred cups, to operate each circuit for forty miles, and he actually used eighty cups in his trials before Congress last May.

But he has now reduced the battery to ten cups, and by an ingenious arrangement of Mr. VAIL's, his Assistant Superintendent, the two independent instruments are operated by this same battery of but ten cups, and *at the same time, too*, without any interference. The Telegraph has been actually efficiently operated with *only two cups!* from Baltimore to Washington, *forty miles*. Thus is the expense of a large battery, with its dirt and care, dispensed with, and the advantage of the Telegraph brought within the means of neigborhoods, of families, and even of individuals.

Another improvement is in the number of characters which may be written in a given time. A person in Philadelphia advertised some little time ago as an *improvement*, that by employing five wires instead of but one, as Professor MORSE does, he could write ten letters to Professor MORSE's one. We are told by one that has examined that plan, that this is a great mistake, for if Professor MORSE should choose thus to complicate his registering instrument, and also to increase four fold more wires he could write double the quantity proposed by the Philadelphia plan. This *improvement* therefore reminds one of the Irish Sergeant's command to his men to *advance five steps backwards*.

The question is often asked, how are rivers to be crossed with the Telegraphic wires? The difficulties to be obviated are the danger of having the conductors disturbed by anchors and drift, if they are laid at the bottom of rivers; or, if spars are erected at the proper distances apart to carry the conductors above the tops of vessels' masts, these obstructions, (not very serious, it is true,) are made to the navigation. Professor Morse has obviated all those inconveniences, by a peculiar arrangement, which, strange as it may seem, requires no wires through, above, or beneath the water.

In December, 1842, Professor MORSE made an experiment across the canal at Washington, to ascertain if electricity would cross the water by this arrangement, and the result was so satisfactory, that he determined to pursue his experiments at a more fitting season of the year. A few weeks ago, his Assistants, Mr. VAIL and Mr. ROGERS, proceeded to the Susquehanna river at Havre de Grace, and repeated the experiment, across that river, a mile wide, and with success; and within a few days Professor MORSE has made some farther experiments on this method of sending electricity across water, which we presume he will give in detail in some scientific journal.

The result of all his experiments, however, is that *no wires need pass through, above, or beneath the water in crossing rivers with the Telegraph.* The *water itself* is made, by Professor MORSE's arrangement, the efficient conductor of the Electric fluid. This discovery of the Professor's is not merely of scientific, but also of practical importance, and leads to new speculations on the availability of the Electric Telegraph in situations hitherto thought to be shut out from its advantages.

We can do no more at present than to give a suggestion which, we learn, was made by the Professor himself, that should there be constructed a line of telegraphic conductors along the Connecticut shore of Long Island Sound, and also along the Long Island Railroad, every town on the Long Island shore, and also on the Connecticut shore, would be in certain and constant communication with each other, without the necessity of any other connection but the water of the Sound.

From the Mobile Herald.

AN INDIAN BURIAL.

One very fine morning, a few weeks ago, we found ourselves at the break of the day at the brow of the hill on Stone street, just beyond the Gas Works, with our best gun and dog, intent upon slaughtering a few brace of woodcock, and in furtherance of that intent, proceeded to beat down the open woods until we came to the creek. The game was scarce, but we pursued our search in the direction of the Choctaw camp, intending to breakfast there and take a fair start westward with the sun. We kept on until we came within a few hundred yards of the encampment, when in the distance we observed advancing a figure wrapped up in a blanket, and carrying a burden. The noise of a stick breaking beneath our feet, caused it to stop and look up, and we saw that it was an Indian woman bearing a child, her hair hanging in dishevelled masses around her shoulders, and her face depicting the most intense mental anguish. Another moment, she had vanished in the under-growth. Stealthily we followed her as she made a circuit in the woods and regained the path we had just quitted, which she pursued until she stopped at the side of a hill of gentle declivity, the base of which was bathed by a limpid spring gushing from its side in a little torrent. From behind the friendly shelter of a fallen pine tree, we watched her movements, and saw her unstrap from her back the child, and lay it on the grass, its little innocent face turned towards the morning sun. A glance told us the child was dead, and we then knew that its mother's errand to that spot was its burial. The poor mother! We saw her, with a sharp piece of pine, turn up the fresh earth on the hill side, until she had scooped out a cavity, large enough for the last resting-place for the child, she raised it up in her arms, and laid it in its tomb, as tenderly as if the babe still lived, her face tearless, but oh, what anguish expressed its lineaments! She placed all the child's little trinkets one by one, by its side, and heaped the fresh earth and leaves upon it. She paused when the task was completed. It was for a moment. She sprang to her feet, darted a look to the spot where she had placed her child, wildly she turned to the grave, and uttering a shriek which seemed as if the very soul burst forth with it, fell as if lifeless, her face to the ground as if she sought a kiss from it even through the cold soil. We knew the Indian character, and we turned away without saying a word. We continued our hunt. The evening saw us returning home, and we bethought ourselves to pass the spot where we had witnessed the occurrence of the morning. A moment's travel placed us there, and we saw by the new made grave, the watchful mother sitting as motionless as one carved out of stone. We spoke a kind word, it was unheeded, and we placed a hand on her shoulder. She turned her head, and her sad gaze met our eyes; we pointed to the grave, and then to Heaven. A tear stole down the mother's cheeks, and we turned away; ours too were moistened, but they were not moistened for the child, there was nothing to regret for it, for those whom the gods love die young. The flowers fall from their hands unwithered; their eyes close in the sunshine: they go down to the grave as if it were an altar, in their hour of hope and of beauty. They are spared life's greatest agony, that of endurance, and endurance without expectation. Our tears were for the poor Indian woman.

From the New-York Journal of Commerce.

PURITAN RELICS.

Just after the death of the military genius of the Puritans, Miles Standish, his house at Duxbury was burned to the ground. The winds soon covered the site with sand, which has remained, with nothing to mark the spot. The lapse of two hundred years has developed the greatness of the Pilgrims to the consciousness of their descendants, and so hallowed their memory as to impart value, not only to their institutions of unequalled wisdom for their day, but to their habits and manners, and, in fact, to all that was theirs. Under this impulse, a gentleman of Massachusetts has recently ascertained and uncovered the ruins of Miles Standish's humble dwelling, and to the mind of a Puritan antiquary, the toil has been well rewarded. One of the first things discovered, was a peck of barley in a bag, covered with a charred blanket, which crumbled to pieces on being handled; but the barley was sound, though thoroughly cooked by the fire which destroyed the house. This barley has been distributed, in small parcels, to a large number of persons. But the barley was only a small part of the treasure found "hid in the sand." The old-fashioned, long, wrought-iron hinges on which the door turned to admit its valorous owner, were enshrined, an andiron, a hammer, some glass beads, used then, as now, for trafic with the Indians; and above all, a part, including the lock, of that trusty gun which, in the steady hand of Miles Standish, dealt death wherever it was aimed. These relics are to be deposited with some suitable society, and will increase in value as centuries pass away, and the benefits of civil and religious liberty come to be more perfectly enjoyed and appreciated, and the sturdy virtues of the old Puritans come to be more thoroughly understood. They will be held as precious relics and mementos of the mighty men of that heroic age, when liberty to think, to believe, to speak, to worship, and to act, was valued more than property, friends, country, or life. They will be valued when the blood of St. Januarius, the bones of the saints, and all the other impositions by which knavish priests have contrived to impose upon the credulity of superstitious devotees, shall be cast away as things detested.

Speaking of guns, we happened to learn the other day, on undoubted authority, that the gun with which Putnam shot the wolf, is at the bottom of the Ohio river. The General and his son Daniel, afterwards a man of high respectability in Connecticut, were for some reason at the Ohio, and were crossing it in a small boat. It was dark and stormy. The General rowed, while Daniel held the gun. The lad was frightened, and his father reproved him for his fears, and hit him kindly with his oar. Alas, the gun slipped from his hands!

From the New-York Commercial Advertiser.

WHO WAS BLENNERHASSETT?

This important question was supposed to be settled; but a writer in the Louisville Register has brought it up again, by putting forth an answer very different from those which have been heretofore accepted. He says that Blennerhassett was a native of Ireland; and his real name was Lewis Carr, and that he was of a good family, whose influence procured for him an appointment in India, which, however, he was obliged to throw up, at the end of two years, having a vast propensity for getting into scrapes with women and otherwise.—Thence he went to Kingston, Jamaica, where he studied and practised the law, but contrived to make a fortune by dealings of some kind with the buccaniers, who then infested the West Indian archipelago.

Business led him frequently to Mexico, where he conceived the plan of getting up a revolution in that country; but, engaging in an intrigue with a lady of Kingston, he found it convenient to leave that place in a hurry, came to the United States, and purchased his island in the Ohio river. It was on his flight from Kingston that he assumed the name of Blennerhassett.

This writer alleges, moreover, that the beautiful and accomplished lady who shared his romantic solitude on the island, was not his wife, and was deserted by him at New Orleans, after the explosion consequent upon his connection with Burr's project. That he then went to Nassau, New Providence, resumed his true name and the practice of the law, and married. His wedded felicity was disturbed by the advent of his former companion, with whom he had much difficulty, but finally pensioned her off. She returned to the United States, and is supposed to be still living.

Carr, alias Blennerhassett, it is added, was Speaker of the Bahama House of Assembly in 1829; but his conduct was bad, he treated his wife shamefully, was always in pecuniary difficulty, owing to his extravagant habits, and found it convenient to leave Nassau in 1832. Thence he went to Kingston—thence to the United States—and died at Philadelphia about 1833.

The writer professes to have derived his information from the United States Vice Consul at one of the Bahama Islands, who was Carr's partner for many years, and had the story from himself and his wife's family. But we have an indistinct recollection that it was current and disproved, or at least vehemently contradicted, several years ago.

Graham House, 63 Barclay St.

CITIZENS, or transient visitors desiring a quiet home, where a real Temperance diet is proffered them, consisting of Vegetables, Fruits, &c. without stimulants or flesh meats, are invited to patronize this house. Terms moderate. Shower-baths free.

August 8. ROSWELL GOSS.

Books,

For Sale at the Office of the American A. S. Society, 142 Nassau St. N. Y.

THE LIBERTY BELL of 1844, an Annual, published for the Massachusetts Fair, and consisting of various original articles, from the ablest Anti-Slavery writers in this country, Great Britain and Ireland.

XIMENA, AND OTHER POEMS, by *James Bayard Taylor*. Philadelphia, 1844.

THE BROTHERHOOD OF THIEVES, or a true picture of the AMERICAN CHURCH AND CLERGY, by *S. S. Foster*; and various other standard Anti-Slavery works.

New-York, July 4, 1844.

TEXAN REVOLUTION.

Republished (with additions) at Washington, D. C., from the Northampton (Mass.) Gazette.

To which is added,—

A LETTER FROM WASHINGTON, ON THE ANNEXATION OF TEXAS, AND THE LATE OUTRAGE IN CALIFORNIA—REPUBLISHED, WITH ADDITIONS, FROM THE LIBERATOR. By Probus.

This is a pamphlet of about 100 large octavo pages. Only a small part consists of the republications; the additions being ten or twelve times larger than the originals. The subjects discussed, are:—

I. The history and merits of the Texan Revolution, under the following heads:

1. The policy of the President, and the lawless proceedings of citizens of the United States, who went to Texas "to sow a rebellion."

2. Kindness, hospitality, and generosity of the Mexicans; ingratitude and treachery of the revolutionists.

3. Pretexts of the Revolution. Under this head is a very full account of the political changes which have taken place in Mexico, and of their causes;—the working of the Federative or Federal form of Government, as compared with the Consolidated or Central, in the South American States; a comparative history of *Nullification* in Mexico and the United States; the difference between the South American Federal and Central systems substantially that between our present form of government, and the form proposed by ALEXANDER HAMILTON; the political history of the South American States, and the history and prospects of nullification in the United States, some test of the comparative value of the two systems.

4. Real Causes of the Texan Revolution.

II. The subject of the second Part, or Letter, is the design of annexing Texas to this Union, *at the first session of the next Congress*. The subdivisions of this subject are:—

1. Review of a letter (said to have been, originally, private,) of ex-Governor Gilmer, of Virginia, on the necessity of the speedy annexation of Texas.

2. The principles, speeches, reports, official correspondence, and operations of the leading and confidential friends of John Tyler, in the Cabinet, and in Congress; the alliance between them and the leading members of the democratic party for the extension and perpetuation of slavery and the slave trade, by the acquisition of Texas and California; the outrage committed by Commodore Jones in the latter province, a part, and in execution, of the secret schemes of the cabinet, and a natural result of their spirit and purposes; the ostensible reasons for that outrage examined.

3. The determination and tendency of their policy to bring about a war between the United States of the one part, and Mexico and Great Britain of the other; it being perfectly understood that the former cannot be despoiled of territory fifteen times as large as the State of New-York, and eighty times as large as Massachusetts, without war with Great Britain, as well as with her

4. The Oregon Bill, a part of the said schemes.

5. The questions of *Visitation* and *Search*, on the coast of Africa, for the arrest of slave trading pirates; the actual extent of the slave trade, and its exclusive prosecution under the American flag; the Quintuple and Ashburton Treaties, Gen. Cass's pamphlet and correspondence in France.

6. Negotiations of our government with Mexico for the cession of Texas and California, from the accession of Gen. Jackson to the present time; Character and proceedings of Messrs. Poinsett and Butler, ministers of the United States, in Mexico; suppression, and probable destruction of official documents; *cor